

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES. VOL. XXIII, No. 2. FEBRUARY 1943

THE MYSTICAL BODY IN THE ENGLISH MYSTICS

AT first sight we might suppose the subject of the Mystical Body and the English Mystics to be one of merely historical interest, a subject to stir the imagination during some quiet Sunday evening when there was nothing better to do. These recluses and holy priests of fourteenth-century England are dead and buried; people read them with perhaps less interest than the natural mysticism of Plotinus or the Arabs; they have never even been canonized as many European mystics who have gained authority thereby. In fact, however, these gentle, unemotional writers of our own flesh and blood bear a most important message to us today, if only we can listen.

The significance of their teaching regarding the Mystical Body can best be stated in terms of the historic setting of the society in which they flourished. One of the characteristics of a decline in the spiritual energy of any age is the separation of the two essential elements of religion: the external, physical element of ritual and vocal prayer becomes divorced from the interior element of spiritual devotion and experience; law from love, asceticism from mysticism. On the one hand, religion becomes a matter of rigid application of outward forms, of pharisaism and even simony; on the other, it appears in exotic groups of puritans and evangelical enthusiasts who rely solely on the Spirit and the Gospels, and tend towards some type of communism. This separation is apparent in the fourteenth century, when the rot had a firm hold of Western civilization. The official life of the Church had suffered from the Black Death and from constant war. Yet the people needed the leadership of men of God more than ever. The scourges of disease, death and war left the poorer people in wretched poverty and misery unrelieved by spiritual consolation. The Papacy was appropriated by France, and finally appeared to collapse in the Great Schism. Wycliff and Huss appeared on the stage to call the people away from authority and back to the spirit of Christian love, away from external sacramental religion and back to the interior worship in spirit and truth.

Again today decline is evident. The terrible effects of two world wars require no stressing. The external, sacramental religion may seem to some to have failed, and we find a surprising number of lay movements, all to a greater or less degree aspiring to the mystical. This is most strikingly apparent among the Communists, the Pacifists, those who gather in communities for some altruistic motive. Not necessarily Christian, these movements all seek some sort of religion of the spirit. Aldous Huxley turns to Buddhist mysticism; Gerald Heard seeks out the three ways; others gather in Quaker-like groups to await the movement of the Spirit;

while at the opposite extreme the nationalist looks for a mysticism of war and race. The internal element of religion has launched out on its own. The result is, of course, disastrous: schisms, antinomianism, legalism opposed by a puritan mysticism. These are very real dangers of the present day and need a corrective.

A corrective can be found among the genuine mystics of the fourteenth century, and, particularly for us, in the English mystics of that age. And we must look for it in their attitude towards the doctrine of the Mystical Body. For the true attitude regarding this central Christian doctrine must necessarily embrace the two elements: the external hierarchical unity of the one true and apostolic Church centred in the See of Rome and supported by a structure of bishops, priests, sacraments and laws; and also the internal union of all faithful in Christ, bound together in a quasi-formal unity in grace. Today the doctrine has come to mean almost exclusively the latter, and consequently points the way to a vague undisciplined mysticism for which only "good faith" counts and external allegiance to Papal authority and teaching matters scarcely at all. In the fourteenth century, the formulation of the doctrine so fundamental in St. Paul, St. Austin and St. Thomas was not strikingly apparent, but there was a tendency to stress the unity between the soul and God as the one thing necessary, and to forget that this union of love can only be achieved through obedience and conformity to the unifying law of the organism of the Church. There was then, as now, a tendency to separate the external Church from individual spirituality, which means that the doctrine of the Mystical Body was analysed into its component parts.

The tendency towards such a separation is abundantly clear in the English Mystics. Some people imagine that they simply dealt with the union of the individual soul with God and left all external religion to the ecclesiastical practitioners; but this impression is quite false. All of them seem acutely conscious of the two tendencies dragging away from each other, and they are at pains to try to unite them once more in a proper synthesis. This is particularly true of Mother Julian, the most fundamental and most theological of them all. The two strains may be said to be the warp and weft of her revelations; the tension between them is the dynamic force running through them all. The two poles provide an axis upon which her thought turns. She is constantly worried by the apparent discrepancy between what she sees in the spirit of love and what she has been taught from her youth by the external authority of the Church: when she sees no wrath in God, or when God tells her that all shall be well. Yet she, more than any other mystic of her time and country, has made the synthesis between the two elements. The Faith taught by the Church is the essential ground of all spiritual life (cf. Chapters 30-34 especially),¹ but with the same grace also comes the interior movement of the Holy Ghost. "Hereto are we bounden of God, and drawn and counselled

¹ *Revelations of Divine Love*, by Mother Julian of Norwich.

war
own.
posed
and

centh
And
stical
must
y of
orted
ernal
ty in
atter,
n for
ority
rmu-
omas
unity
that
mity
now,
ality,
into

n the
n the
o the
them
each
proper
unda-
said
is the
axis
arent
e has
when
well.
made
church
ally),¹
Holy
selled

and le
ed by in the
l als by wh
ver The
o see ing o
ow to Ghos
orde natur
is a Holy
ent of welde
top is the
f th this p
le m l In
tions
its un
win Chur
thol short
i.e. o
win tions
in The
M. "the
Rich
Vase thing
hear
ng sin o
ll in excu
ayer has
Co poin
shan forg
urch prie
7 an This
in the
athe "anc
ette thou
orker And
chi ordi
d of t
Scal
H. abo
is E
reg
tea
wh
onl
Ac

and learned *inwardly* by the Holy Ghost and outwardly by Holy Church in the same grace" (c. 30). "By three things man standeth in this life: by which three God is worshipped, and we be speeded, kept and saved. The first is, use of man's Reason natural; the second is, common teaching of Holy Church; the third is, inward gracious working of the Holy Ghost. And these three be all of one God: God is the ground of our natural reason; and God, the teaching of Holy Church; and God is the Holy Ghost" (c. 80). In the latter quotation we find the natural man welded into the supernatural by the two elements of the Kingdom which is the Church. Here she sets forth a compendium of the whole thesis of this paper.

In the other writers the tension is not so consciously felt; but its vibrations form the pulse of their work. The hall-mark of true mysticism is its unhesitating adherence to the external authority and sacraments of the Church, and its refusal to be swept by an ardour of love into an attempted short cut through the spirit alone. The first steps in the life of the spirit, i.e. of union in the Mystical Body, must be through the external ministrations of the Church. "If this spot be any special sin," says the author of *The Cloud of Unknowing* of washing the foul spot of sin from the visage, "then is this well Holy Church, and this water confession" (c. 35). And Richard Rolle in *The Form of Living* insists on the same procedure: "the things that cleanse us from that filth are three. The first is sorrow of heart . . . the second is shrift of mouth (oral confession) against the sin of the mouth, and that shall be speedy without delaying, naked without excusing, whole without separating . . . the third is satisfaction, which has three parts: fasting, prayer and alms-deeds" (c. 6). Walter Hilton points out that even if a sin be forgiven through true repentance, that forgiveness is conditional if the sin be mortal "so that he shrive him to his priest at the bidding of Holy Church" (*Minor Works: Bonum Est*, c. 1). This master of the spiritual life makes *faith* in the articles of the Creed and the sacraments of the Church the groundwork of a contemplative life: "and though thou feel any stirring in thy heart against any of them, be thou steadfast . . . set thy faith generally in the faith of Holy Church . . . And it behoveth thee to love and worship in this heart all the laws and ordinances made by prelates and rulers of Holy Church, either in declaring of the faith, or of the sacraments, or in general of all Christian men" (*The Scale of Perfection*, Bk. I, c. 21). There is no puritanical antinomianism about that adherence to the external structure of the Mystical Body.

The only one who speaks in any way untraditionally on this subject is Rolle in the *Incendium Amoris*. Prelates and the external hierarchy are regarded by him as being lesser in the life of union; whereas St. Thomas teaches that the episcopal state is the highest of all religious states. "Those who are highest in love and contemplation of Christ direct their thoughts only towards divine things, and they do not take authority among men . . . Active men, therefore, and prelates outstanding in knowledge and virtue

should set contemplative men constantly before themselves, and hold them to be their betters before God" (c. 3; and cf. c. 14 *circa finem*). Yet he nowhere suggests that these contemplatives can reach their heights without the help of such lesser men. He inveighs against the heretics and proud men who "bring forth new opinions and propound improper questions against the teaching of Holy Church. And so those things which faithful Christians hold firmly, they rejoyce to disparage with their vanities" (c. 6). The three virtues that join the soul to God grow out of the Church: "so it behoves thee to do if thou wilt find Him: seek Him inwardly in the truth and hope and charity of Holy Church" (*The Commandment*).

In discussing the doctrine of the Mystical Body, therefore, these two axis points must both be equally considered. The one that is most in men's minds today is that of the union by grace of all Christians in Christ. And that point, of its nature, tends to receive greater emphasis in mystical writers, who are principally concerned about the union of the individual soul with God. But even if we regard this as the formal element, it makes the other none the less essential for being "material". The hierarchy and the sacraments, the external and visible Body of Christ, form the fibre of this tree of life. Excommunication *officially* cuts one off from communion with, union in, the common fellowship of all in Christ. This essential aspect of the Mystical Body, though often forgotten today, was not neglected by the true mystics of fourteenth-century England.

We must distinguish between the passages where these mystics refer explicitly to the Mystical Body by name and those that contain the fundamental ideas of the doctrine without explicit mention. As would be expected, the explicit passages are scarce, with the exception of those in Mother Julian's *Revelations*; and as a rule they are limited to the consideration of the love of one's "even-Christians", who are all united under the one Head, who is Christ. Walter Hilton is most picturesque in his discussion of the second of the two great commandments: "Our Lord Jesus Christ as man is head of all the ghostly body which is Holy Church. The members of this body are all Christian men: some are arms and some are feet, and some are other members after sundry workings that they use their in living. Then, if that thou be busy with all thy working in thy might for to array his head—that is, for to worship himself by mind of his Passion and of his other works in his manhood and by devotion and meditation of him—and forgettest his feet that are thy children and thy servants, thy tenants and all thine even-Christians, and lettest them spill (i.e. perish) for default of keeping, unarrayed, unkept and not tended to as they ought for to be, thou pleasest him not, thou doest no worship to him" (and so it continues: *Minor Works: The Mixed Life*, c. 8). The celebrated twenty-fifth chapter of *The Cloud of Unknowing* teaches the same doctrine but from the purely contemplative angle, namely that one should seek perfection, that is perfect love of God, not simply for oneself, but for the betterment of all Christians. "A soul that is perfectly disposed to this work and thus

one with God in spirit, doth what in it is to make all men as perfect in this work as itself is. For right as if a limb of our body feeleth sore, all the other limbs be pained and distressed, or if a limb fare well, all the remainder be gladdened therewith—right so is it ghostly with all the limbs of Holy Church.” And he goes on to say that the individual must “strain up his spirit” for the salvation of all his brethren. This approach should be deeply pondered by all who wish to reach a synthesis today between the external and internal elements of membership in Christ.

Since one of the chief sources of this doctrine in the Gospel is found in our Lord’s identification of His disciples with Himself—“what you have done to the least of my disciples you have done unto me”—the social aspect is most in evidence here. Injustice in a disordered social system stands in direct opposition to the union of all Christians in Christ as taught by Him in this parable. But charity in society, rather than justice, is the first concern of these writers. “Whoso clotheth a poor man and doth any other good deed for God’s love, bodily or ghostly, to any that hath need, let them be sure that they do it unto Christ ghostly: and they shall be rewarded as substantially therefore as if they had done it to Christ’s own body. Thus saith he himself in the Gospel” (*The Cloud*, c. 58). “And the poor,” says Rolle, “however much they be clad with squalor and uncleanness, should not be despised, for they are the friends of God and the brethren of Christ, if they bear the burden of poverty with acts of thanksgiving” (*Incendium*, c. 8). The aim of the spiritual man is to see Christ in all mankind, since every man is his brother and in some way—at least potentially—a member of His Body. Suffering humanity is suffering Christ, and reveals the Crucifix once more—though Margery Kempe seems to extend this view even wider, when the suffering of animals brought her into the presence of the suffering Christ: “When she saw the Crucifix, or if she saw a man had a wound, or a beast, or if a man beat a child before her or smote a horse or another beast with a whip . . . she thought she saw our Lord beaten or wounded” (In the *Cell of Self-knowledge*, p. 54).

Mother Julian, as usual, penetrates more deeply into the mystery and sees the compassion of man for the suffering of his even-Christian, not simply as leading the man to find a suffering member of Christ crucified, but as itself the effect of the identification of Christ with the one who is compassionate, the cause of his compassion. “Then I saw that each kind compassion that man hath on his even-Christians with charity, it is Christ in him” (c. 28). The identification of the soul with Christ means that the spirit and love of Christ crucified works in their subject as well: it is Christ in him who is compassionate, suffering with others.

In the present-day stress on the doctrine of the Mystical Body we have noted a tendency to over-emphasize the spiritual element as distinct from the external; but at the same time we can also detect an exaggeration of a non-essential aspect of the external element. I mean the excessive insistence on the corporate nature of the Mystical Body in terms of the

spiritual life, revealing itself especially in an unbalanced devotion to the liturgy. If the correct tension between the external and internal is not maintained in this respect, the soul becomes immersed in the material, attached to forms and organizations that are essentially of this world. We must be careful not to develop a corporatism round the Body of Christ that could be equated with the unspiritual corporatism of the Nazi or Fascist, nor to be caught up in an aestheticism of the liturgy that confuses prayer with poetry. But if we think of the Mystical Body solely in terms of union with our "even-Christians" and our social rights and duties, such an exaggeration is easy.

Again we find the balance established by these English mystical writers. They are, in fact, far less impatient of liturgical forms of prayer than the more individualistic mystics of the post-Reformation era. Meditation and the official prayer of the Church work together to bring the life of the Body to every individual. "They that be true workers in this work, they worship no prayer so much as those of Holy Church; and therefore they do them, in the form and in the statute that they be ordained of holy fathers before us" (but cf. the whole of this passage in *The Cloud*, c. 37; and cf. Hilton: *The Scale*, Bk. I, c. 27). And yet they are careful to notice that of itself alone this external expression of the prayer of the Mystical Body is valueless; as, for instance, Margery Kempe: "Thou shalt have more merit in heaven for one year thinking in thy mind than for an hundred year of praying with thy mouth" (op. cit. p. 53). And Rolle even seems to have practised a very passive form of assistance at Mass, refusing to sing at Mass because he preferred the music of contemplation in his heart (*Incendium*, c. 31).

The mystical approach is obviously the most calculated to counteract any excessive corporatism or attachment to forms of this world. These writers are principally concerned with the primary element of the Mystical Body for the individual soul: participation in the divine life, or union of the soul with God. Dealing almost exclusively with the individual soul, their message is of first importance: it tells him, in effect, that his part in the Mystical Body is played, not principally by active co-operation with the other members of the Body, but by being united to the Head, by union with Christ. The rest follows from that. Membership in the Mystical Body demands an undivided attention to saintliness in a humility and self-abasement that clear the decks for action with God alone. "The feeling of this lowness shall put out of thine heart unskilful beholding of other men's deeds, and it shall drive thee wholly to beholding thyself, as if there were no man living but God and thou" (*Scale*, Bk. I, c. 16). "Look that thou loathe to think on aught but himself, so that nought work in thy mind nor in thy will but only himself. And do that in thee is to forget all creatures that ever God made and the works of them" (*The Cloud*, c. 3). Such quotations could be greatly multiplied (cf., for example, Rolle: *Incendium*, c. 37; *Form of Living*, c. 4; etc.), for "my soul and my God" is always the theme of the mystical writers.

Some, however, have regarded this as a danger for ordinary people, teaching a kind of supernatural individualism or a sublimated selfishness. On the contrary, this approach is the only way to avoid an attachment to the externals of the Mystical Body, to the accidental and material accoutrements of a living Supernatural Body. The mystics insist only on detachment from all save God alone, detachment from any delights or loves that are not in God; they insist on a supernatural view of mankind and all that concerns mankind. Hence they go on to say that having become attached to God alone by the divine love of charity, one is joined through God to all men; and that brings the synthesis of the external and internal elements. "Love is such a power that it maketh all things to be shared. Therefore love Jesu, and all thing that he hath it is thine. . . . Knit thee therefore to him, by love and by belief; and then by virtue of that knot thou shalt be common partaker with him and with all that by love so be knitted to him; that is to say with our Lady Saint Mary . . ." etc. (*The Cloud*, c. 4). And Richard Rolle, in the *Incendium Amoris* and *The Mending of Life*, frequently stresses the same fundamental principle (for quotations of this nature cf. Comper: *Life and Lyrics of Richard Rolle*, pp. 121-3). Full membership in the Mystical Body demands this detachment from all earthly things and a fundamentally supernatural return to them through Christ. Here is the real basic union of the Mystical Body.

This is no camouflage for a sublimated individualism, as some might be inclined to imagine. For in spite of the continual emphasis on God and the soul alone, the English mystics do hold to the necessity for salvation of the external official Church of Christ. We have already noted their ready acceptance of the authority and all the external circumstances of the Church. They insist not only on the desirability of a synthesis between the internal spirit (expressed perhaps in individualistic terms) and the external element, but also on the complete necessity of such a synthesis. Hilton gives the profound reason for this necessity in the simplest of terms; that God, to whom the single soul flies, is united to and in some way identified with the Church herself. But Hilton must speak for himself: "An heretic sinneth deadly in pride, for he chooseth his rest and his delight in his own opinion and in his own saying, for he weeneth that it is sooth—which opinion is against God and Holy Church—and therefore sinneth he in pride deadly, for he loveth himself and his own will and wit so much that, though it be openly against the ordinance of Holy Church, he will not leave it, but resteth him therein as in soothfastness, and so maketh it his god; but he beguileth himself. For God and Holy Church are so oned and accorded together that whoso doth against one he doth against both . . ." (*Scale*, Bk. I, c. 58). "Outside the Church, no salvation" is no mere scholastic tag to be carefully explained away. Salvation is in the Mystical Body, and the Mystical Body must always be identified with the Church. In the sense in which the Church is thus "oned" with God, it is not merely to be sought out as a means to the final goal, salvation, but is itself in some way to be

identified with salvation. The Church on earth is a means to life eternal, but life eternal is lived in Christ, in union not only with the Blessed Trinity, but with the humanity of Christ and with all faithful souls. We can then surely apply Mother Julian's description of heaven as of our Lord in his house as being the final state of the Mystical Body. "In this Shewing mine understanding was lifted up to heaven where I saw our Lord as a lord in his own house, who has called all his dearworthy servants and friends to a solemn feast. Then I saw the Lord take no place in his own house, but I saw him royally reign in his house, fulfilling it with joy and mirth, himself endlessly to gladden and to solace his dearworthy friends..." (*Revelations*, c. 14). This is the final goal and perfection of the Mystical Body, and only in view of that can we hope to gain any understanding of the nature of this mystery or of how it works.

Since the other writers give only passing references to the explicit doctrine of the Mystical Body, we must henceforth take almost exclusively Mother Julian's *Revelations* for a thorough explanation of the mystery. She alone builds up her whole conception of the way of salvation in explicit terms of this doctrine.

To begin with, the union of all men in the unique human nature in which they all share provides the natural foundation for the union of all men in the man Christ. But at first this unity is the cause of the separation of all mankind from God through the Original Sin of the first man. In the striking vision of the Lord sitting and the Servant running and falling "into a slade" where he "taketh full great hurt", Mother Julian saw mysteriously the servant identified with the old Adam, and then the New; but in each case he stands at the same time for all mankind (cf. c. 51 seq.): "The Servant that stood afore the Lord, I understood that it was shewed for Adam; that is to say one man was shewed, that time, and his falling, to make it thereby understood how God beholdeth *All-Man* and his falling. For in the sight of God all man is one man, and one man is all man" (loc. cit.). But she goes on to explain that in spite of his fall, man's nature was not destroyed; although he was *evilly* rather than mystically one, his will remained whole. Hence mankind as a whole is redeemable; but God works a redemption that is entirely gracious and unmerited, infinitely above the nature of man. Instead of being raised simply to a natural goodness in which man would have remained One only in the union of his own nature, however much patched up, he is caught up into the unity of the divine life. And this is effected by God becoming man. Thus Mother Julian suddenly finds that the Servant toiling in the slade is Christ the Lord, the new Adam. "In the Servant is comprehended the Second Person in the Trinity; and in the Servant is comprehended Adam; that is to say, *All-Man*. . . . When Adam fell, God's Son fell; because of the rightful oneing which had been made in heaven, God's Son might not be disparted from Adam. (For by Adam I understand *All-Man*.) Adam fell from life to

death, into the slade of this wretched world, and after that into hell; God's Son fell with Adam, into the slade of the Maiden's womb, who was the fairest daughter of Adam" (id.). The profundity of this vision of the birth of the Mystical Body in the physical birth of Jesus Christ occasioned by All-Man's sin demands a prolonged meditation impossible within the scope of this paper.

This oneing of all men in Christ was not itself achieved at the Incarnation, but in the fulfilment of the purpose of the Incarnation (and an action is only fully realized in its end, its purpose) through the Passion and Death of our Lord. "Thus hath our good Lord Jesus taken upon him all our blame, and therefore our Father nor may nor will more blame assign to us than to his own Son, dearworthy Christ" (id.). After the Crucifixion and Resurrection, the work of the Mystical Body begins; this new Body begins to live in the world as Christ, for it is identified with Christ. And its purpose is to continue the working of Christ after his glorification, it continues to redeem and sanctify, to apply the merits of the suffering of its Head. And yet it is itself imperfect—or rather, the members individually are imperfect, not the Church herself. "For one single person may oftentimes be broken, as it seemeth to himself, but the whole Body of the Church was never broken, nor never shall be, without end" (Mother Julian: *Revelations*, c. 61). For while its Head is the glorious and perfect Christ sitting at the right hand of the Father, its members continue the battle with evil on earth and are themselves often, if only temporarily, overcome. "For anent that Christ is our Head he is glorified and impassible; and anent his Body in which all his members be knit, he is not yet fully glorified nor impassible. Therefore the same desire and thirst that he had upon the Cross (which desire, longing, and thirst, as to my sight, was in him from without beginning) the same hath he yet, and shall have unto the time that the last soul that shall be saved is come up to his bliss" (*Revelations*, c. 31).

Our Lord therefore yearns for the perfection of His Mystical Body; but that can only be accomplished by means of the prolongation of His Passion. He continues to be crucified and to suffer through His members, and in that way to extend the effects of His Passion and draw all men to God. This means, from our point of view, that we must suffer with Him, become fellow victims with Christ on the Cross. On this point Rolle is very expressive: "It is written of Christ 'that it behoved Christ to suffer and so to enter into his glory' (Luke xxiv, 26). If we are members of our Head, Jesus Christ, we shall certainly follow Him. And if we love Christ, we ought to walk as He walked; otherwise we are not His members for we are divided from the Head. Yet it is a dreadful thing if we are sundered from Him, for we are then joined to the devil, and at the general judgement Christ will say 'I have not known you'" (*Incendium*, c. 18). But it is left to Mother Julian to see the mystical identification of the present sufferings of the Christian with those of Christ himself on the Cross; she adds new horizons to the doctrine of co-victimship with Christ, "Here saw I a great

oneing betwixt Christ and us, to mine understanding; for when He was in pain we were in pain. And all creatures that might suffer pain, suffered with Him: that is to say, all creatures that God hath made to our service. The firmament, the earth, failed for sorrow in their kind in the time of Christ's dying" (c. 18). She explains this compassion of all for Christ by deep love which brings His lovers "pains more than their own bodily dying" (id.).

We may conclude then that the Mystical Body in fulfilling its function of redemption on earth is welded into a compact unity by sorrow and pain illumined by the living light of charity. It is unnecessary to stress the fact that the greatest message that these mystical writers have for those who have begun to understand the doctrine of the Mystical Body is that love is the key to union, so that practically every word they have written is implicitly bound up with the mystical union of all souls in Christ. They bring a fresh breeze into the doctrine, preserving it from the stagnation of externalism. There can be no need to quote so constant an idea. But the author of *The Cloud*, in one of his shorter works, puts it in such a way that we are led immediately to the form, the constitutive element, of this otherwise unknown unity of individuals in one Body. "Saint Austin saith that 'if thou love the earth or gold, thou art then earth or gold; and if thou love God, then art thou God'. That is to say, partaker with him by grace, as it is showed in the Psalm 81 *Ego dixi dii estis*. 'I said,' saith the prophet unto the lovers of God, 'that ye be gods.' Or else, more verily: If thou love God perfectly, *thou art a limb of Christ*." (*How Man's Soul is made to the image and likeness of the Holy Trinity*.) In *The Cloud* the author makes the necessary distinction between nature and grace in this divinization (N.B. c. 67). By means of the virtues, and chiefly by means of love, grace gives the soul the form of God. We all participate in the same individual, singular form, the form of God which can never be divided or multiplied—there lies the essence of the union. Mother Julian's expression of this identity of form is unparalleled: "By the endless assent of the full accord of all the Trinity, the Mid-Person willed to be *Ground* and *Head* of this fair Kind (i.e. human nature): out of whom we be all come, in whom we be all enclosed, into whom we shall all wend, in him finding our full heaven in everlasting joy . . ." (c. 53). "For it is full easy to believe and trust that the dwelling of the blessed Soul of Christ is full high in the glorious God-head, and soothly, as I understand in our Lord's meaning, where the blessed Soul of Christ is, there is the *Substance of all the souls* that shall be saved by Christ" (c. 54). And she goes on to show how by this quasi-substantial union of all souls in Christ we are led to dwell in God and be united to God *without intermediary*, because the Soul of Christ is united to the divinity without an intermediary. All this is summed up in an earlier passage, very greatly compressed: "God shewed full great plesance that he hath in all men and women that mightily and meekly and wilfully take the preaching and teaching of Holy Church. For it is his Holy Church: he is the *Ground*, he is the *Substance*, he is the *Teaching*, he is the *Teacher*, he is the

End,
all so
Chri
thes
one
so th
the
He i
T
mak
reach
still
in th
soul
is th
prov
Way
us u
save
whic
to H
bliss
C
and
Tha
forc
desir
thirs
sigh
and
be, v
us al
as fu
V
Eng
of St
Here
spiri
integ
of un
on th
grace
the C
that
the S

End, he is the *Meed* for which every kind soul travaileth" (c. 34). Thus all souls in a state of grace are mystically united in the Godhead through Christ the only channel of grace. Moreover, the unity of nature between these souls and Christ's human soul makes the ground and substance of the one Body; for different natures participate in the divinity in different ways, so that Angels, although in a state of grace and enjoying the Godhead in the Beatific Vision, have not the same membership in the Mystical Body. He is the Ground and Substance of *human* souls in grace.

Then again the identification in nature between men's souls and Christ makes it possible for Him to be the Ground, not only of those who have reached the perfection of heaven, but of those imperfect souls who are still striving towards perfection. These, in the vale of tears, participate in the divine life of grace in the same way, being human, animal-rational souls, but in a lesser degree than those who have reached the goal. That is the way Christ works as Head and Ground; directing all to heaven and providing them with a unique and single foundation. "Thus Christ is our Way, as surely leading in his laws, and Christ in his Body mightily beareth us up into heaven. For I saw that Christ, us all having in Him that shall be saved by Him, worshipfully presenteth His Father in heaven with us; which present full thankfully His Father receiveth and courteously giveth to His Son, Jesus Christ; which gift and working is joy to the Father, and bliss to the Son, and liking to the Holy Ghost" (c. 55).

Grace working in the souls of Christians on earth welds them together and prepares them for the final completion of the Mystical Body in heaven. That is the goal of grace, the purpose which makes it a dynamic, vital force of unification. This can well be described as our Lord's panting desire for the goal, his thirst which began on the Cross: "This is the ghostly thirst of Christ: the love-longing that lasteth and ever shall, till we see that sight on Doomsday. For we that shall be saved and shall be Christ's joy and His bliss, some be yet here and some be to come, and so shall some be, unto that day. Therefore this is His thirst and love-longing, to have us altogether *whole in Him*, to His bliss, as to my sight. For we be not now as fully whole in Him as we shall be then" (c. 31; cf. all cc. 30, 31).

With this we must leave the mystical writers of fourteenth-century England. It could be shown how closely all this is allied to the teaching of St. Thomas, but that would require another paper and a different purpose. Here we have sought to show that the teaching of these too often neglected spiritual writers has an important message for us. They can teach us to integrate our lives in the living spirit of Christ's Church, avoiding the appeal of undisciplined spiritism on the one hand, and deadly activism or legalism on the other. The nature of the Mystical Body is revealed as derived from grace in the substance of the soul and love in the will; but it is always the Church with its authority, its sacraments, and above all its rule of Faith, that they see as directing, informing, canalizing the energy and power of the Spirit.

CONRAD PEPLER, O.P.

ENGLISH ECCLESIASTICAL ARCHITECTURE: RETROSPECT
AND PROSPECT

When we mean to build,
We first survey the plot, then draw the model;
And when we see the figure of the house,
Then must we rate the cost of the erection;
Which, if we find outweighs ability,
What do we then but draw anew the model
In fewer offices, or at least desist
To build at all?
Much more in this great work,
Which is almost to pluck a kingdom down
And set another up, should we survey.
The plot and situation and the model,
Consent upon a sure foundation,
Question surveyors, know our own estate,
How able such a work to undergo
To weigh against his opposite: or else
We fortify in paper and in figures,
Using the names of men instead of men:
Like one that draws the model of a house
Beyond his power to build it, who half through
Gives o'er, and leaves his part-created cost
A naked subject to the weeping clouds,
And waste for churlish winter's tyranny.

Shakespeare: *Henry IV*, II, I, 3.

IN these well-known lines are expressed, with the force of poetic genius, the purpose and scope of the following study, written in the hope that it may be of some slight service to those who will be called upon in the near future to initiate and control the building of our churches.

It is not addressed primarily to architects, to whom its contents will for the most part be familiar; nor has it been the writer's intention to submit yet another treatise on the history and aesthetics of Ecclesiastical Architecture—subjects which have been so fully dealt with during the last hundred years and more by antiquarian and other specialists.

Since the beginning of the present century the practice of building and its allied crafts has undergone drastic change: a process which will undoubtedly be maintained in the years ahead of us. Economic factors, no less than the need of organized "communal planning", will make this inevitable, and it will have to be recognized that the disposition of all buildings, and their architectural character, are matters affecting the interests of the community as a whole, and that they must therefore be the subject of reasonable control. In accepting this we shall, after all, only be reverting to conditions by which the work of the best period of our native art—that of the Catholic mediaeval centuries—was governed; conditions which, to our grievous loss, were destroyed at the Reformation, to be replaced, in modern times, by the competitive individualism now fast becoming bankrupt.

An attempt to examine all this in detail, and to take stock of what has already been accomplished during recent years, seems therefore to be not

inopportune, since the problem of bringing its results into harmony with traditions which are unchanging will, obviously, confront those in authority and their advisers.

At the outset let us remind ourselves that fidelity to tradition is a thing of the spirit and not merely of the letter, and, since we live in a changing world, that an art which fails to take this into account can never be other than ephemeral.

The actual subject of the ensuing study is the planning and designing of the future parish church of average size and character; of a building, that is to say, moderate in its dimensions and governed by normal financial considerations. Churches of outstanding importance, whose sites are not restricted and for whose erection and equipment ample funds are available, must, obviously, present special problems which cannot be brought within standardized conditions; and, on different grounds, this remark will apply to the smaller type of church in rural districts, having a seating capacity of—let us say—not exceeding one hundred.

The subject of the origin and development of church planning is one which has been exhaustively dealt with during the last hundred years, and at the present time it commands an ever-increasing standard of scholarship. No recapitulation of what is already familiar to those interested is therefore needed here. The following quotations, however, will be useful by way of introduction.

"The period of 1000 years, roughly A.D. 300–1300, from Roman to Renaissance Art, is an organic one, beginning with a change in the spirit of Classic Art, produced by Oriental mysticism, and Christianity, which brought forth the first great Mediaeval School in the East."¹ "When the Goths, Franks, Lombards, and the rest flowed over the Roman Empire, it was natural that men should turn to the great artistic capitals of the East, and absorb what they might of the traditions which had, in them, been preserved."² "There is much more of the East in Gothic Architecture, in its structure and fibre, than is outwardly visible." (ib.)³

Records as to what happened during the first three hundred years of persecution, whilst still meagre, are being constantly increased by scientific research, but it may be assumed that the Eastern origins, noted in the above quotations, would naturally be reflected in the earliest Christian monuments, and however scanty present evidence may be, the hope that this process may continue, as has happened in recent years in regard to periods infinitely more remote, has every justification.

In our own country material evidence has survived in the foundations of a small Christian church at "Calleva" (Silchester); in tombstones bearing Christian inscriptions from military sites in the north; and, in the south, there is the occurrence of the Sacred Monogram in the floors of certain villas. None of these, according to Collingwood and Myres,⁴ is

¹ W. R. Lethaby, *Mediaeval Art* (Duckworth, 1904), pp. 5–6.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 6.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 6.

⁴ *Roman Britain and the English Settlements* (Oxford, 1937).

of an earlier date than the fourth century. Lethaby¹ regards the plan of Silchester as of Eastern, rather than of Roman, type, comparing it with that of an early church at Nicopolis (Greece); he notes that the altar was placed in front of the apse, and that it had a narthex opening on to an atrium, and the centre of the latter was a font. Of this same church Collingwood remarks that there were certainly others like it, quoting St. Bede's statement that "remains of Romano-British Churches were recognizable in his day (7th Century)". His conclusion is, however, that none of these remains admit of accurate dating and that the survivors of Roman Britain in the west, where there was no Anglo-Saxon penetration, professed Christianity which survived there until, by way of Ireland, it came back to England.

We therefore find the model adopted for the first Christian churches the ancient Roman basilica, with its nave, aisles, apse, narthex, and atrium, and the modifications devised to meet the requirements of Christian worship and ritual. Out of this was evolved the typical Romanesque church, of which old St. Peter's and the existing church of San Clemente, Rome are outstanding examples.

Now amongst these modifications there was one, the substitution of a wagon-headed vault for the timber roof, which was destined to produce consequences of the highest moment, since it was from the resulting problems of vaulting that the so-called Gothic architecture came to its birth.

In Roman vaulted buildings stability is the result of inert resistance, the weight and thrust of the vault being supported by masses of equally solid brick and concrete, the whole structure being, therefore, "static". The substitution of a system which was "dynamic", stability being achieved by means of a balance of active forces, constitutes one of the greatest revolutions in the science of building, and herein, and not in the use of the pointed arch, lies the generative principle of Gothic architecture. "It is through the roof, and not the window, that the formative 'Gothic' idea entered." The bearing of this on the problem of modern church design arises from the fact that, since the close of the last century, just such another structural revolution has been in progress, through the application of modern scientific methods to the craft of building, and the immensely increased resources which the use of mild steel and concrete have placed in the hands of the engineer and the architect. And since the results of this are seen both in increased stability and obvious economic gain, no criticisms which are based solely on sentimental grounds can be expected to prevail. Actually, then, it may be said that today "the wheel has come full circle", bridging the millennium and bringing back once more the principle of a "static", opposed to a "dynamic", construction. As a consequence of this the earlier "revivals" and "period" designing has been swept into limbo, and the characteristic canons of nineteenth-century architecture have become obsolete as its furniture, transport or lighting, and it has become the task

¹ *Londonium* (Duckworth, 1923), p. 217 ff.

the church-builder to bring these accomplished facts into harmony with standards of tradition which are unchanging and unchangeable.

The fundamental mistake of the Revivalists of a hundred years ago lay in their attempt to limit, within a period of some 300 years, the features of an art which was itself part of a continuous development of more than a thousand. Moreover, they failed to realize that the attempt to re-establish an art, the principles of which were essentially co-operative, under the conditions of an age of competitive individualism, was quixotic and altogether hopeless.

The humanism of the Renaissance tended to regard all creative art as dependent on the genius of the individual artist, thus greatly restricting the imaginative range and power which had been so distinctive an attribute of the more disciplined labour of the mediaeval craftsmen artists. But notwithstanding this changed outlook, the age-old spirit of English handicraft survived through centuries of spiritual decline, like the afterglow of a great sunset, lending a distinction to the works of an age which had become more concerned with the things of this world than with those of the spirit.

In a "classical" dress the plan of the Latin Cross was preserved in the churches of Wren and his successors, serving the purposes of a maimed liturgy, and the handiwork of the mason, the sculptor and the rest of the allied crafts continued to flourish until the impact of the new Industrialism swept them away. The Catholic revival, coinciding as it did with this economic debacle, made the task of its pioneers, in effect, one of making bricks without straw. When the "Revivalists" started out on their crusade, sound and straightforward work in the "classical" manner then universal was being done, examples of which may still be seen in scattered parts of the country; and of these churches it must be said that, whether one judges them by aesthetic standards or by those of practical utility and sound construction, they certainly compare favourably with the spate of cheap and immature neo-Gothic buildings which from 1840 onwards began to flood the land and to swallow up our all too scanty resources.

Whilst it must be admitted that these latter buildings were the outcome of laudable zeal and self-sacrifice, the zeal, at least, was too often one "not according to knowledge"; in fact, as is now clear, the movement, at least in its early stages, was vitiated by a failure to grasp the effect of the prevailing social and economic conditions.

In their impatience, it was overlooked by Pugin and his immediate successors that a complete change in social conditions must be brought about before any attempt to create an art, based on the co-operative methods of the Middle Ages, could hope to succeed. This came to be realized later by William Morris and his fellow workers in the Arts and Crafts movement, and today the shock of world events seems to be tending towards an enforcement of their ideals.

Nineteenth-century art, it may not unfairly be said, was never a vernacular product: its best results were only achieved where lavish expen-

diture and the command of outstanding individual talent were available, and, in the nature of things, these "gifts of the gods" were seldom within the grasp of Catholics, who had to reconcile an ever-growing demand for new churches with a poverty of material resources and the existence of many other pressing calls. Thus we came to be saddled with many commonplace and poorly constructed buildings, in which traditional models were travestied, and which went far to discredit mediaeval art in the eyes of discerning critics and the public generally.

In the first years of the present century the new cathedral of Westminster signalled the end of these long years of frustration, and after the European War new forces, which had long been gathering, were released, and the way was cleared for a revolution in the art of building as profound as that of the thirteenth century, the fruits of which are already to be seen in much of our recent church-building.

The foregoing retrospect is one which had to be recalled before attempting to discuss practical problems of the future. In the mirror of history we see the reflection of a native art which ranks high amongst the triumphs of human genius, an art harmonizing with Christian tradition whilst conforming to the changing conditions of the centuries during which it flourished. And, conversely, we have witnessed in our own day the comparative failure of attempts to re-create such an art by methods largely subjective in character, and alien to those on which it rested.

Now if architecture is, as has been so often claimed for it, the "Mistress Art", and that by which all others are sustained and served, then the service of God, in things material, must always be its highest manifestation, and we may reasonably ask ourselves whether its ends can be attained in any other way than by a return to those methods and principles by which it was governed in the ages when admittedly it did discharge so sublime a function.

In such a return there need be nothing reactionary; on the contrary, it will be in strict conformity with the trend of the best modern practice, in itself largely a natural result of the growth in the scale and complexity of building operations. The character of buildings and the harmony with their surroundings are, equally with fitness for their purpose, matters in which the community as a whole has a legitimate interest; and to leave these things to the mercy of individual errors of judgement, to which the best of us—being human—are liable, cannot be justified on any reasonable grounds. "Architecture," as a radio speaker recently remarked, "is the art which affects each and every one of us; and whoever builds appropriates a portion of space and atmosphere which is the common property of all, and what he does with it affects us all equally." It follows, therefore, that the erection of our future churches ought not to be undertaken without some form of independent expert examination, for the preliminary guidance of those on whom the ultimate responsibility devolves.

So far from such a procedure being an interference with the prerogative

tives of the Clergy and their professional advisers, it would greatly simplify and strengthen the position of both, as indeed already happens in the case of the joint consultations which have long been compulsory (e.g. in the case of schools) with the expert advisers of Government departments and local authorities. The following extract from the recent Report of the Reconstruction Committee of the Royal Institute of British Architects will serve to show the probable future trend in this respect:

1. *As to future legislation*: In place of the existing multiplicity of Acts, Bye-laws, etc., a National Code should be compiled to cover the whole country, to be administered from a single office in each locality. Under this National Code only one application for approval should be necessary, but submission of plans should be compulsory for all types of buildings without exception.

2. *As to control of land*: All land without exception should be publicly controlled whether it is to be publicly or privately owned.¹

The records of mediaeval building, now available in such researches as those of Messrs. Douglas Knoop and G. P. Jones,² afford detailed evidence of the systematic organization and control to which the work of that period was subjected. In no other way, indeed, and least of all by the unco-ordinated and competitive individualism of the nineteenth century, could the art of the Middle Ages have been created.

We may now refer to some of the outstanding details which affect the planning and design of modern churches in the light of the foregoing retrospect.

"When we mean to build, we first survey the plot"; let us begin, therefore, with the choice and treatment of the site, upon which the ultimate success or failure of every work of architecture depends. In the whole range of architectural failure there is nothing more tragic than a well-designed building wrongly sited: a tragedy for which there is usually no remedy.

It should no longer be permissible, for instance, as the result of insufficient area or unsuitable shape, for the main entrances of a church to abut directly on to a public highway, thereby causing obstruction of the latter, and rendering impossible orderly assemblage and dispersal, not to mention the convenient and dignified carrying out of ceremonial on public occasions. Unlike the case of buildings used for secular purposes, the public entrances of a church will normally be at its western end, and this should involve the provision of a narthex, in which a full complement of doorways can be suitably disposed, and the interior protected from draught

¹ R.I.B.A. *Journal*, August 1942, pp. 167, 169.

² *The Mediaeval Mason* (Manchester University Press).

and unseemly disturbance of divine worship. Except for emergency purposes, public entrance and exit doors at the north-east or south-east ends of a parish church are rarely convenient.

A western narthex should abut on to open space, proportioned to the seating capacity of the church itself, corresponding to the atrium of the Roman basilicas. In many nineteenth-century urban churches, where the had been originally provided for, pressure of debt and other causes have subsequently led to the disposal of portions of a site not actually built over, with results usually disastrous and beyond remedy. Often, too, it has happened that the generosity of donors of land has been nullified by the speculative bias of their agents and surveyors, who, in developing their estates, have allocated plots of ground as church sites which were unsuitable for more profitable purposes. In the future, no doubt, when urban areas will be laid out under "town-planning schemes" by experts in this specialized branch of design, the cramped or mis-shapen site, with its waste and distortion, will no longer continue to be the architect's nightmare. Difficulties of contour are, of course, a problem with which the latter should be equipped to deal: often, indeed, these will prove a spur to his ingenuity in districts where steeply falling ground is a characteristic feature. Sites of this type, however, must necessarily increase the first cost of building whilst demanding a larger area of land on which to lay out the approaches.

The nature of the subsoil, with its bearing on the question of foundations and drainage, is, perhaps, unlikely to be overlooked in these days. But the past has had its warnings in this respect, and with the increasing use and potentialities of "monolithic construction" the subject is one which will demand special vigilance and the consultation of experts.

It is, then, on the wise selection and treatment of the site that the success of every architectural conception ultimately depends. No student of our ancient parish churches needs to be told how much these owe to the instinctive skill with which they were sited, and it is indeed the merest truism to say that whilst the architect's best efforts will be ineffective on a bad site, a good one may even go far to redeem a building in itself of no more than ordinary merit. It is the *ensemble*, not the richness or profusion of its details, on which the effect of every architectural creation depends. To realize this one has only to look at such masterpieces as the choir of York Minster, or—amongst modern examples—Ostberg's Town Hall at Stockholm.

We may next consider some of the conditions by which the planning of future churches will be governed, and ask ourselves to what extent, whilst allowing a proper degree of latitude for variety of taste and temperament—some approximation to a fixed type, based on the liturgical uses of our own day, must be expected to develop. The neo-Gothic churches of the nineteenth century were to a large extent based upon the study, by means of measurement and delineation, of surviving mediaeval examples.

Such methods were a prominent feature in the training of the contemporary student, and it must be conceded that the records which were thereby accumulated have been of the greatest value; indeed, they were essential in a period when photographic reproduction was in its infancy. This approach to the study of architecture, however, was predominantly subjective and tended to confuse the power to design with clever draughtsmanship; its outcome has not unfairly been labelled "Period Architecture", a thing subject to the caprice of fashion, rather than to contemporary conditions.

The mediaeval parish church, a building devised for the celebration of an unchanging rite in the Sacrifice of the Altar, was, in many respects, used under conditions differing from those which began to operate after the Reformation and the Council of Trent; these may be summarized, for present purposes, as the fostering of an ever closer and more intimate participation by the laity in the Divine Sacrifice. In our own day the public celebration of the latter in parish churches normally takes place at the high altar, and this calls for a sanctuary shorter in length than the chancels of mediaeval times, which were generally planned for the chanting of the Office by choirs of Regular Clergy; Masses for the laity being offered at altars (often moveable) placed within the body of the church and westward of a rood gallery or "Pulpitum". Failure to take this into account led to the adoption, in many neo-Gothic churches, of what has been termed by Mr. Goodhart Rendel "the obstructed complex plan"—the high altar being placed at the eastern extremity of a chancel of unduly prolonged length, on the apparent assumption that the old-time choir of clerics would be replaced by one of lay choristers for the celebration of High Mass and Vespers; an arrangement which has rarely been found practicable in the parochial life of today. The result of this, apart from waste of space, was to interpose too great a distance between celebrant and congregation, and when, as usually happened, aisles and transepts were seated, to deprive many worshippers of a clear view of the high altar itself. A further incongruity was to make the latter subsidiary to a large traceried East window—an arrangement neither aesthetically satisfactory nor in strict accord with rubrical prescription.

The experience of present conditions has, inevitably, caused the supersession of ideas which were largely antiquarian, and in most modern churches we see a return to the western choir gallery (*bête-noir* of the Revivalists and a favourite theme of Pugin's satire), to the planning of a sanctuary large enough for the celebration of pontifical functions, with direct and ample space for the administration of the Holy Eucharist to large numbers, the provision of side chapels, and dignified access to the pulpit and sacristies. The provision of transepts, completing the traditional "Latin Cross", whilst not invariably necessary, will help to secure these requirements, and at the same time will serve to emphasize the isolation of the sanctuary, thus adding to its dignity and importance; framing, as it were, the high altar and

reredos, which thus becomes the focal point of the whole interior, on which the eyes of all worshippers are centred.

A problem of importance in the new conditions of today is that of the treatment of the traditional nave arcading, a feature hitherto so universal as to lead many to regard it as a *sine qua non* of the basilican type of plan. Modern construction, however, with its slender carrying piers and comparatively thin intervening "panel walls", and the substitution of internal steel ties for the external buttress, has deprived the old type of nave arcade of its original structural significance, reducing it more or less to a purely decorative feature. In these conditions the actual function of the aisle becomes that of an ambulatory for processional purposes, for access to confessionals, shrines, and side chapels, and for the celebration of the Stations of the Cross. In all this there is no violation of tradition, as a study of the aisleless, internally buttressed churches of Languedoc, Catalonia and elsewhere in mediaeval Europe will make clear.

"One consideration exercised a profound influence on the plan of the Catalan churches, viz. that they were intended not merely for monastic but also for public worship: the outstanding problem therefore . . . was how to build a church large enough for an enormous congregation, and yet with a high altar which all, or nearly all, could see. . . . The precedents were the aisleless churches of Languedoc, supreme examples of which are the Cathedral and Jacobins Church at Toulouse, S. Michel and S. Vincent at Carcassone, S. Jean Perpignan, Albi, etc."¹

In a fully equipped modern church, one of the side chapels—often a Lady Chapel—should be large enough for the special services of Guilds and Confraternities, and, of course, a parish room should be provided which should have direct communication with the Clergy House and an external entrance readily seen and approached from the nearest public roadway.

The provision of a new church usually involves a heavy burden of debt on its Rector and parishioners, and with the ever mounting cost of all the building crafts, it is now imperative, even more than in the past, to consider not only structural economy but the bearing of this on the cost of future maintenance and renewal. It cannot be denied that these factors were often overlooked by the neo-Gothic builders, who were apt to sacrifice them to purely aesthetic preoccupations. It should have been obvious, for instance, that elaborate carved and "undercut" moulded masonry, used externally, would not stand up to the atmospheric conditions of the average modern industrial district. And, as regards internal finish, the immediate economy of plastered wall surfaces was cancelled out by the costly painted decoration soon stained and blackened by exposed heating

¹ Bernard Bevan, *History of Spanish Architecture*, Batsford, 1937, pp. 87, 88.

pipes, faulty ventilation and other agencies, and demanding periodical renewal.

Mediaeval churches were fully treated in colour, and with the wide range of permanent coloured materials which are now available to the designer it has become possible to envisage the permanent polychromatic treatment of a church based upon their use, and forming a part of the initial cost, including the more elaborate enrichments of the sanctuary and chapels with their accessories, by mosaic, painted sculpture or low-relief modelling, and the use of marble and precious metals to such extent as available resources may permit.

In every type of building designed for public use, modern hygiene has provided effective methods for the ready elimination of dust and dirt, and the reduction to a minimum of the labour of cleaning, by means of "radiant", in place of "convected", heating, and by scientifically sound systems of lighting and air-conditioning. All these, not to mention the immensely important subject of acoustics, can only be made to play their part in a well-designed building by their due consideration in the initial stages of its shaping.

The literature of recent years, with the aid of present methods of photography, has tended to increase and to diffuse more widely a general knowledge and appreciation of traditional English Art, and to help everyone to realize its wide range and individuality. The published works of such writers as A. W. Clapham, the late W. R. Lethaby, A. Gardner and others,¹ in bringing all this home to a world of admirers, have raised in many minds a doubt as to whether anything comparable can be achieved on the basis of constructive conditions now ruling. Those who entertain such doubts seek confirmation in what impresses them as the baldness and severity of modern architecture, and its lack of decorative imagery—such as arose naturally out of the mason-craft of the thirteenth and succeeding centuries. Is it possible, they ask, for any comparable developments to take place in an architecture based on the use of steel, brick and concrete?

The answer is that great architecture has always rested on practical foundations, and has grown out of the severity imposed in initial and experimental stages, to an increasing freedom and elaboration. It should also be remembered that, in all the Arts, the supreme characteristic of the masterpiece has been complete directness and simplicity. When we think of mediaeval architecture in terms of its sculpture and decoration we must not forget its engineering origin, nor the fact that in its later stages it was over-elaboration which foreshadowed its ultimate decay.

C. M. HADFIELD.

¹ A. W. Clapham, *English Romanesque Architecture before the Conquest; English . . . after the Conquest*; various papers in *Archaeological Journal*. Lethaby, op. cit., also *Mediaeval Art, Westminster Abbey and the King's Craftsmen*. A. Gardner, *Handbook of English Mediaeval Sculpture*, Cambridge, 1937. M. D. Anderson, *The Mediaeval Carver*.

A NEW CATHOLIC EVIDENCE

NOT the least of the problems that after the war will call for solution for the more effective furtherance of the Catholic cause will be the method for best presenting Catholic doctrine to our fellow-countrymen.

This problem is not in essence different from that other which has for so long exercised the minds of zealous Catholics in this and other countries: how best to present the social doctrine of the Church. It is not essentially different, because Catholic social doctrine is nothing more than the communal application of Catholic morality. And unless Catholic social reconstruction has the implicit intention of converting those outside to the Church, it is less than useless. It will not even achieve its object of securing social justice, for social justice that does not acknowledge another sphere of rule but that of Caesar's has no proper sanction. There is, it is true, a natural sanction for justice, but an age that has already largely repudiated the Christian principles that confirm natural morality can hardly be relied upon to base society on so secure a foundation. And since Christ, there is no proper security in any social foundation other than Christianity.

The presentation of Catholic social doctrine is properly an offshoot of the campaign for conversion. And there is a difference between the major and the minor campaign in methods of approach. The Catholic social worker in his contact with non-Catholics must assume that the non-Catholic has a basic knowledge of just social principles. It is not his function to instruct so much as to guide. The Catholic Evidence worker, too, must assume that his audience has a minimum knowledge of Catholic doctrine. But his first concern will be to know how much he may assume.

If I speak of Catholic Evidence in particular, it is not because the problem is that of the lecturer in particular. On the contrary, it is the problem of all who would be active in the conversion of England. If it is said to be a "Catholic Evidence" problem, that is only because the technical Catholic Evidence is to individual activity what Catholic Action is to everyday Catholic activity.

What may be termed the intellectual approach has for many years been losing ground in the estimation of the workaday Catholic apologist. That is not surprising in an age which is content to let the so-called intelligentsia do its thinking for it. And it is still less effective because of the general rapidly decreasing hold not only on Christian truths but on ordinary logic. The uncritical attitude of the man in the street is perhaps not better illustrated than by the almost universal acceptance of a *history* of *pre-historic* times. It would almost seem that dullness of religious perception has gone hand in hand with the lack of thought which fails to write down the men who propound such a thing as charlatans.

The war, while not minimizing these objective difficulties, has added new factors which need to be taken into consideration when a scheme for putting forward Catholic doctrine after the war is framed.

One of these factors is the fact that there has been during the war a new official recognition of the efficacy of religion. An encouraging sign of the times was in a message in Fleet Orders from the Board of Admiralty recently. It said: "In the conviction that the present war is a struggle between good and evil, and that in the practice of the Christian religion may be found today the same support experienced by our forefathers in establishing in the Royal Navy those ideals of service and sacrifice we have inherited, Their Lordships, while appreciating that under conditions of war the instructions regarding Sunday work can seldom be realized, wish to emphasize the need for observing the instructions for the holding of Divine service and prayers. They further direct that in battleships and cruisers all possible steps should be taken to provide a space set apart for the worship of God." The new trend is also to be observed in the allowance which the B.B.C. programmes make for religious talks and services.

This official encouragement of Christianity embraces a more sympathetic attitude towards the Catholic Church. This may represent to some extent a political move, designed by our statesmen to provide a telling counterweight against Nazi and Communist persecution. On the other hand, it may be a belated recognition of the Holy Father's place in world affairs. But even if dictated by diplomacy, it does imply that the Catholic interest is worth propitiating; the very implication is an acknowledgement of the strength of Catholicism. And the Holy Father, whom not even warring hosts can eclipse, will be more in the public eye than ever when the piping times of peace relieve the black-out.

The man in the street cannot but be influenced by official religious "propaganda". The mass-production spirit of the age is allied to what Christopher Dawson has described as "mass opinion and mass emotion". It is too much to expect, perhaps, that because the B.B.C. says "pray!" all will pray. But men in the mass will begin to think prayer a reasonable thing because the B.B.C. says it is.

But even if people are hearing more about religious worship and more about Catholicism, and may be hearing more still as the war goes on, there is little or no general knowledge about Catholic truth. The decline in religion outside the Church, admitted and deplored by Protestant divines, makes even a fundamental knowledge of Christian truth an unsafe thing to be presumed. Even where there is a modicum of knowledge there is rarely much understanding. There are probably few in this country such as the apparently intelligent young man—a tale vouched for by a priest—who did not know that Christmas was the celebration of Christ's birth. But there are very many who do not know what they owe to Christ's birth; many, too, who do not acknowledge that they owe anything to it except a bumper spurt in trade if they be tradesmen; an unwelcome spell of overwork if they be shop assistants; and most others a general giving and taking in which there is a complaint that the balance is nearly always on the wrong side.

In framing an apologetic scheme, there is also an opposing factor to be taken into account: the fact of an anti-God element. This, numerically, would seem to be of little moment. But since anti-God energy is concentrated against religious, and more especially Catholic, activity, we must expect to find it in disconcerting force wherever Catholics are in action. We must expect, moreover, the anti-God propaganda of the future, having gained in experience and temerity, to be far more subtle and persevering than hitherto.

The apologist's line of approach must be adapted to deal with the masses who, if ignorant, may be presumed to be willing to listen; while it must allow for those who are chiefly concerned to suppress his voice, without, however, deviating so far as to become involved in argumentation which would not suit his main purpose. It is not merely the allowing for the ordinary heckler in public, or the objector in private; it is more a question of how to prevent the objector taking the platform.

It is appropriate that we, as Christians, should ask ourselves how Christ Himself would have dealt with the problem. We may be more realistic and recall how Christ did actually deal with a similar situation. For Christ's hearers were largely very ordinary folk of goodwill. It was the small group of Scribes and Pharisees who were opposed to Him. They, because they were anti-Christ, were anti-God, even though they were ostensibly and notoriously religious. They are an example and a warning of the subtle form that anti-God propaganda may take; a warning necessary in these days when apparently zealous Christians have made their appearance on the public platform with Communists.

There may be occasions when the Catholic apologist can with profit follow Our Lord's example of verbally castigating those who made it their business to impede His work. But this may not be done indiscriminately, and is in general suited better to private conversation than public lecturing.

Christ's approach not only to His immediate hearers but to all men may be said to have been first of all in His *being* Christ. His approach was human by the fact of the Incarnation. His contact with men was first of all through His and our common human nature.

But since the Passion and Death of Our Blessed Lord, the link between Him and other men has been annealed. The bond has been tightened because suffering, which no man can escape, binds men together more surely than the consideration of their common humanity. Its effect is not only on the speculative faculty, nor merely on the senses; it touches the heart in a way that no other experience or emotion can.

Christ's approach to men since His Passion and Death is through suffering. A world in pain provides the common ground on which He may most easily meet us. And who shall say that the world today is not qualified to receive Him? Already the sufferings borne in common through the war have served to unite men. "People who had not spoken to each other

for years are now fast friends," said a man from a much-bombed area. "The war is teaching them to be civil."

How many of the folk who are suffering the agonies of war on the home front in England today have more than a hazy idea of the sufferings of Christ? And how many of those who have even that hazy idea ever bring them to mind? During the war, and after, common endurance will have prepared the ground. An account of the Man who suffered will touch a chord which in pleasure-saturated pre-war days would not have responded.

Jeffery Farnol says somewhere that no man should write until he has suffered. If it be presumptuous to apply this to preaching, and to say that no one should preach until he has suffered, it is certainly not presumptuous to say that no one can preach effectively on the sufferings of Christ until he has suffered. And that, happily, is a qualification that no Catholic apologist will now be without, for suffering is universal. And the "point of contact", as the American sales-courses term it, between the speaker and his audience, whether public or private, is already established by their war trials borne in common.

A scheme of descriptions of the chief sufferings of Our Lord would stimulate thought and inspire reverence. Shown side by side with present-day world sufferings, they would be enlightening. The Agony of Our Lord in the Garden; and the agony of terror in expectation of frightfulness to come: "Let this chalice pass from me." The Scourging at the Pillar; and the pain of being under fire, bombed, wounded perhaps. The Crowning with Thorns; the crowning agony of losing loved ones, home, and possessions. Our Lord meeting His mother; the excruciating pain of separation from husband or wife, children, or other loved ones. The Crucifixion; the agony of it all, day after day, week after week, and month after month; the perpetual anxiety and fear of worse things: "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" It is a scheme which might be said to be an all-the-year-round adaptation of the essentials of Father Vincent McNabb's Good Friday "Stations".

The method was practised by the early Christians. "We preach Christ crucified," said St. Paul. The sufferings of Christ took precedence because they established the human interest without which his preaching would not have secured an audience, and because from them flows the whole of Catholic doctrine.

The B.B.C. has lately shown itself alive to the naturalness of this method. But the weakness of the non-Catholic attempt to preach Christ crucified is in its failure to grasp the supernatural. It is all very well to offer to the sufferer the consolation that Christ also suffered. It may help the sufferer to *bear* his sufferings but it does not indicate how he may *use* them. It does not answer the question: "What have I done to deserve all this?" The reply to that involves the explanation that it is not necessarily the individual that has deserved it but humanity as a whole. It involves an explanation of the gravity of sin, and the purpose of Christ's sufferings. It needs

to be extended to show the individual sharing in the sufferings of Christ and in His work of the Redemption. The exponent, in fact, must take his exposition beyond the human plane; he must not rest content with demonstrating a parallel between present-day sufferings and the Passion of Christ. He must show present-day sufferings as the application of the Passion of Christ.

Some may object that all this is to take the man in the street on to too high a plane; that doctrinal explanations must be adapted to his understanding. It is true that they must be put into simple language, and carefully gradated in a series of talks. But as for its being on too high a plane, what other can we choose than the supernatural plane to which Christ has intended all men to be lifted? It is His intention, moreover, that men should grasp the meaning of the supernatural life; and His simple exposition of grace to the Samaritan woman at the well is one which is a model that might be used more often than it is.

The solidarity of Christians, and potentially mankind in general, by their supernatural relation with Christ, leads by easy stages to an exposition of the Church. And if again it be objected that the emphasis on suffering and its reparatory value is to place the emphasis on heroism, is not that in keeping with the spirit of the times which have demanded heroism from everybody? Is not the choice also for the practising Catholic today in the moral sphere a choice not between sin and a passable minimum of virtue, but between sin and the heroic, because the days are evil?

The real war may come "after the war"—a bloodless struggle for social justice. This, if it come, will entail more suffering: change of habits and uprootings necessitated by the shifting of living and work centres; hardships following on the inevitable collapse of the money-power. The Communist and anti-God contingent, faced with a presentation of Catholic doctrine which commences with sympathy for the sufferings of the "underdog", may be nonplussed. Developing as it will into an exposition of the dignity of suffering mankind, and the exalted place of the sufferer in God's scheme, it may well have a profound and salutary effect even on the irreligious. Even those who came to scoff may remain to pray.

C. J. WOOLLEN.

SECOND THOUGHTS ON THE NEW "WESTMINSTER HYMNAL"

"FOR better or worse" (I am convinced that it is very much for the better) we have, for our lifetime, a new "Westminster Hymnal". That being so we must try to make the best of—not a bad—but a good job. The new hymnal, which departs in so many ways from the older book, was bound to

have raised a storm of criticism when it was first published. It certainly did. But by now everyone has had ample opportunity of expressing his views, or at least his first impressions of the new book, for the Catholic Press was generous in allotting space to the subject. Even letters prefixed with such remarks as "I know nothing about music, but . . ." were given hospitality in some of the Catholic papers. Why then, it may well be asked, yet another article? Certainly not to stir up afresh criticisms, wise or unwise, which by now may be forgotten, but rather to suggest a method of approach to the new book which may make it more readily acceptable, more quietly adopted and more quickly appreciated.

In most matters it is possible, and often easy, to be tactless. The introduction of a new hymn-book into a parish requires tact in plenty, for clergy, choirs, and congregations all have their opinions and sensibilities. There have been parochial wars for lesser matters. From the first, then, it is well to bear this in mind.

Then, it should be remembered that in this matter people are, on the whole, conservative. Quite rightly they feel that what has been proved good should be preserved and not easily discarded. To start by introducing the new tunes for the old, well-established favourites seems tactically the wrong thing to do. It will arouse opposition—almost venom—towards the whole enterprise. The old familiar tunes to "Sweet Sacrament Divine", "Jesus, my Lord, my God, my All", "Hail, Queen of Heaven" and others are to be found in the appendix of the new book. At first it is well to retain these. Why stir up opposition needlessly and from the outset?

The first aim should be, surely, to open up as widely as possible the many treasures of the new book. This will not be done by learning new tunes for hymns that are already sung, but by learning a few carefully chosen tunes which will enable as many as possible of the new words to be used. A judicious use of the metrical index is therefore desirable. For instance, the tune of 128—a noble tune, easily learned and retained—may be sung to all the other hymns of this metre that are in the book. Eventually the proper tunes may be learned for each of these—but not at first. The learning of 128 will enable five of the best hymns in the book to be sung: 128: "This is the day whereon the Lord's true witness"—a splendid translation of *Iste Confessor* by J. O'Connor; 171: "Jesu, the dying day hath left us lonely"—a beautiful original evening hymn by him; 32: "God, of thy pity, unto us thy children"—a Lenten hymn of rare beauty suitable for all seasons; 69: "Father most holy, gracious and forgiving"—a hymn to the Blessed Trinity. To acquaint a congregation with a new tune it must be sung on several successive occasions; if the tune can be set to four or five alternative hymns its repetition will be less trying.

Another tune that may be used in this way is 111, "Virgin wholly marvellous". It is simple and easy to learn. To it may be sung 44: "In the Lord's atoning grief"; 90: "Jesu, grant me this I pray"; 108: "God in whom all grace doth dwell"; and, less aptly, 163 and 178. In this way, the

learning of two tunes will enable at least nine new hymns to be sung, all of them of great richness.

In a similar way tunes that are already known may be sung to new words. The tune "Pearsall", now set to 211, "O King of kings, in splendour", may be sung to 82: "O Jesus Christ, remember" (to which it was set in the old book), and to 212: Chesterton's "O God of earth and altar".

A further suggestion is to learn a few Long Metre tunes, for these may be sung at Benediction to *O Salutaris Hostia*. Notably there are 97: "To Christ the Lord of world we sing" (*Deus tuorum militum*), a hymn for the feast of Christ the King with a tune of much grandeur very suitable for the *O Salutaris* on big feasts; also 94: "Was ever, Man—look well and see", a most plaintive tune which may be used for 92, "And now, my soul, canst thou forget" and 93, "O wounds upon the healing hands"; 85: "Look on this wounded heart, and know", and the *O Salutaris* during penitential seasons. Tallis Canon 167, and "Eisenach" are also suitable for the *O Salutaris*.

It is to be hoped that the "Veni Emmanuel" (Nos. 4 & 232), and the Passion Chorale (41), harmonized by J. S. Bach, will be among the first hymns learned, and that they may become widely known and loved as they deserve to be.

In general, it seems best to learn the easier rather than the more difficult tunes first. We may well be tempted to learn such hymns as Mgr. Knox's "O English hearts, what heart can know" to the English Martyrs (145), and his translation of the *Ubi caritas*, "Where is love and loving kindness, God is fain to dwell" (200), for they are magnificent. They are difficult to learn, however, and it may be wise to save these good things until the time when the congregation has acquired a facility of learning new tunes. On the other hand some tunes are very easily mastered. Among these are 78: "Hail, true Victim, life and light" and 114: "Maiden, yet a Mother". These could be learned by an average congregation within five or ten minutes.

Some hymns can be sung only on one or two occasions in the year. Without practice they will be forgotten by the time they are sung a second time. It seems well to leave these to the last.

As the proof of a pudding is in the eating—and, we might add, in the digesting—so the worth of a hymn-book is in the singing and the knowing. We have in the new book nearly all the hymns that were commonly sung from the old book, and we have much more—many treasures, both old and new. It is to be hoped that these good things may be known and possessed more and more. Then criticism will give way to appreciation.

H. P. THOMPSON.

SERMON NOTES

THE WAY, THE TRUTH, THE LIFE

I

INTRODUCTORY Sermon (which can be omitted, and given in substance at the beginning of No. II below, so as to make a three-sermon course).

Text, e.g. 1 Cor. i, 13, *Was Paul crucified for you?*

Via, Veritas, Vita, the three victory-signs of the Christian religion. I am the Way, I am the Truth, I am the Life, staggering claims which differentiate our Lord's way of talking from that of any other religious teacher. Yet in each case, it is to be noticed, He addresses His apostles in a rather similar way, as if to suggest that they share the activities of His Incarnation. He says, I am the Way; He does not say, You are the Way. No, but when He says, I am the Door, He does say something rather like that to St. Peter; I will give thee the keys. I am the Truth; He does not say, You are the Truth. No, but when He says, I am the Light of the world, He does say the same thing to His apostles; You are the light of the world. I am the Life; He does not say, You are the Life. No, but when He says, I am the good Shepherd, He does communicate that office to one of His followers, Feed my sheep.

Why is it that some of the titles He claims can be handed on to his followers, while others are peculiar to Himself, incommunicable to any other? The answer is not far to seek. Through the Incarnation our Lord is, in a mystical sense, the actual stuff out of which our redemption is wrought. It isn't merely that He points the way to God; He *is* the Way to God. It isn't merely that He knows the truth; He *is* the Truth. It isn't merely that He gives life to our starving, thirsting souls; He *is* the supernatural Life we breathe, *is* the Food that nourishes that Life within us. You will sometimes come across an old-fashioned Protestant who bases his objection to the Church on this mystical ground. He believes in the direct, immediate influence of Christ on the human soul. He will not have bishops or priests coming between him and his Master, claiming to be a sort of channel through which grace is bestowed; he does not need any such channel. When he talks in that way, he is partly in the right; only, he has misunderstood us. We, like him, believe that no human creature can come between us and our Master. But there is another side to the matter. While Christ, as the Head of the mystical Body, is the very Means, the very Source of our sanctification, He is also the first-born among many brethren, and in this human capacity of his He can share His titles with others. He can delegate His responsibilities, He can refract His light, He can canalize His munificence.

He *was* the Truth; but He also came as a witness to the Truth, and when He left the earth He appointed His apostles witnesses in His stead. (See how in the pastoral epistles, and in the Apocalypse, the *marturion*, the *homologia*, is both the witness Christ bore and the witness we bear to Christ; 1 Tim. vi, 12, 13.) He *was* the Way by which we were to reach

salvation; He was also the Door-keeper who had power to bar the way or open it, and when He left the earth He bequeathed to St. Peter and His successors the same duty of guardianship. He *was* the Food of our souls; but He was also the Shepherd who administered that Food, Priest as well as Victim, and since He has left the earth He, whose Victimhood is unique, has been content to share His Priesthood with others.

II

I am the Way; I am the Door; I will give thee the Keys.

Text as above (John xiv, 6; x, 7; Matthew xvi, 19); or Isaías xxii, 22.

When our Lord calls Himself "the Way", He does not mean a bare direction in which we ought to travel; He says "no one comes to the Father except through me". Nor are we to suppose that He is speaking of His own example, or His own teaching, as a "way" of life, though it was so called (Acts ix, 2). The Epistle to the Hebrews gives us the clue to His meaning; He has inaugurated a road for us, enabling us to enter into the most holy place, hitherto inaccessible to us (ix, 20). Buddha professes to shew us the Way, Christ claims to *be* the Way. The Atonement is necessary *necessitate medii* for any soul that will find its way to God; even the patriarchs, and whoever else "pleased God" under the old dispensation, could do so only in virtue of its foreseen merits. Think of our Lord, if you will, under the image of a roadway which enables us to pass over treacherous marshes and unplumbed chasms; but in the symbolism of the New Testament (as in the passage from Hebrews just quoted) it is more usual to represent what He did for us as an opening, a *way through* an impassable wall that stood as a barrier between us and God.

But, this breach once made in the wall of separation, He who made it did not leave it open for all and sundry. You make an opening, and then put a door in it; you admit some, exclude others. And our Lord would control the use of the way He had made for us; it should open to those who obeyed the conditions He Himself laid down for its use. He left behind Him an institutional Church, with its rules of membership and its standards of behaviour. And He bequeathed, to St. Peter and His successors, the office of door-keeper. If there is to be a visible Church, somebody, necessarily, must be entrusted with a position of command. Long ago, God had prophesied that Eliacim, the son of Helcias, would be made chamberlain of the Royal Palace in Jerusalem; "I will lay the key of the house of David upon his shoulder," says Isaías, "and he shall open, and none shall shut, and he shall shut, and none shall open" (Is. xxii, 22). In the revelation which He made to St. John, our Lord identified this prophecy as referring to Himself (Apoc. iii, 7). All the more remarkable, then, that He should address the chief of His apostles in almost the same words, "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matthew xvi, 19). To entrust a person with the keys is a natural symbol of giving him your complete confidence. The key is such a small thing, and yet it is master of the situa-

tion; easily lost, and if you lose it, the whole door is shut to you! So Christ's human Vice-gerent is only a man (and may be a bad man), but to be out of communion with him is to be cut off from Christ himself. It is through the ante-chamber that the Royal Presence is approached, and it is the chamberlain who can give you access to the ante-chamber. The Church is the ante-chamber of heaven; you have no right to expect admission to the Presence except by that way. And of that way, the successor of Peter holds the keys.

(It is hardly necessary to point out that the same theme can be developed so as to make a sermon on the Sacrament of penance, the effortless opening of a heavy door with an insignificant object, the key, reminding us of the simple and easily accessible means of release which God's mercy has provided even for those guilty of grave sin.)

III

I am the Truth; I am the Light of the world; you are the light of the world.

Text as above (John xiv, 6; ix, 5; Matthew v, 14); or Gen. i, 3.

"I am the Truth" is an irritating translation; it should be, of course, "I am Truth". The work of Creation begins with the words, "Let there be light", as if to shew us that things began to be intelligible when they began to be; reality and truth proceeded from the same Principle—from the Word which is the self-expression of the Father, the Life which is also the Light of men. The revelation which God saw fit to send us might have been a message conveyed by an angel; but, instead of merely revealing the truth, He revealed to us Truth itself. When Pilate, weary of trying to discover *the* truth, gave up the problem by asking, "What is Truth?", the answer to the question was the Man who stood before the judgement-seat; He it is who gives all things their truth and their reality. And when He comes into the world, everyone who is "of the truth"—belongs to the party of truth, derives his character from the truth—listens, instinctively, to this Man who is Truth itself, responds automatically to his appeal.

At the same time, our Lord did come into the world to teach us *a set of truths*; things about the supernatural world which we could not have found out for ourselves. In this sense, too, He is the light of the world; and in this sense He can make His apostles the light of the world, by communicating to them the truths which they are to reflect in their teaching. Reflected light (the moon's, for example) is none the less light because it proceeds from a principle outside itself. And the teaching of the Church makes no claim to originality; it is simply Christ's teaching reflected in her glass. When she defines doctrine, she is not contributing anything of her own to the illumination which she has received; she is only (as it were) polishing her own orb so as to make it reflect the borrowed rays more perfectly.

(It is easy to give this sermon a personal twist by pointing out that, although "You are the light of the world" was evidently said in reference to the apostles chiefly, it was part of a public utterance to which the multitude

listened, although at a distance. Every Catholic by knowing his faith, and still more by living it, is shedding light on a world which publicly professes to be enlightened, but is really sitting in darkness, and knows it.)

IV

I am the Life; I am the good Shepherd; feed my sheep.

Text as above (John xiv, 6; x, 11; xxi, 17); or Numbers xxvii, 16.

Life is the great mystery of nature. It emerged mysteriously from inorganic matter; so first grace vivifies the spiritually inanimate soul, "I am the Resurrection and the Life". It organizes a single body, communicating itself to every part of that body, and not to anything outside it; so sanctifying grace quickens the Mystical Body in every part; "I am the Vine, you are the branches." The living body can absorb things outside itself, and so nourish the life within it; so in the supernatural order we absorb, or rather, are absorbed by, supernatural nourishment; "I am the Bread of Life." Christ is Life (once again, "the Life" is a false translation), Life in all its mysterious processes. To the mystic, He is not merely the *vita quam vivimus*, but the *vita quam vivimus*; "To me, to live is Christ" (Phil. i, 21), the human individuality seems flooded out with this inrush of supernatural energy, till he cries out that he is no longer alive, it is Christ that lives in him (Gal. ii, 20). In proportion as the supernatural life thrives within us, we ourselves become part of that Life, lose the sense of our individuality in the consciousness that we are cells of the Mystical Body. In all this, Christ's work is unique, and His titles are incommunicable; no apostle can be our Life, any more than he can be Truth, any more than he can be the Way.

Yet, because we are body and soul, Christ Incarnate has seen fit to nourish this life within us by means of sacraments, outward things. And these sacraments will have to be administered to generation after generation of the faithful by human hands. Thus He communicates to others one of the dearest, one of the most gracious of His titles; the good Shepherd, rallying His scattered flock and leading it out into Galilee (Matthew xxvi, 31, 32), makes one of them Shepherd in His place, a Josue to replace a Moses (Num. xxvii, 16). Nor is He content to bequeath that title to Peter or even to the apostolic college only; from the first, bishops and presbyters are invested with the pastoral office (Acts xx, 28). "Give *you* them to eat" (Matthew xiv, 16); the one Victim is to be made available to the world by millions of priests. So terrifyingly close does heaven stoop down to earth, when God becomes Man.

R. A. KNOX.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

UNITED SERVICES

(1) Is a Catholic boy allowed to join in the night prayers led by a non-Catholic lay club-leader in a non-Catholic club?

(2) Is a Catholic leader allowed to read the prayers or, at least, assist at them in a non-Catholic club of which he is an officer? (E. S. A.)

REPLY

We have heard it maintained that both the above practices are justifiable, at least in the circumstances of the present time, when all Christians are trying to present a united front against the forces of unbelief. If they are justifiable it means that a momentous change will be introduced, both in the principle underlying the prohibition of *communicatio in sacris*, and in the practice which Catholics in this country have always followed in the past. It is our opinion that no private individual, whether priest or layman, should introduce this change; it is a matter for the judgement and direction of the local Ordinary. On the principles which are at present our rule of guidance, principles summarised in canon 1258, and commented upon in this journal, 1942, XXII, p. 77, the answer to the above questions is:

ad (i) A Catholic may not join actively in these night prayers; if he cannot avoid being present, his passive assistance may be tolerated as directed by canon 1258, §2, and with the safeguards mentioned therein.

ad (ii) The Catholic leader's "assistance" is provided for in the answer ad (i). He may, however, as leader, recite a formula of prayer which is indisputably a Catholic formula, e.g. the night prayers from the "Manual of Prayers". It may be true, indeed, that the non-Catholic formula, e.g. that contained in the "Book of Common Prayer", is orthodox in its expressions, but it remains unlawful for a Catholic publicly to use a form of worship not authorized by the Church.

KNEELING DURING THE MARRIAGE RITE

Further to the reply given, 1942, XXII, p. 464, even granted that our own *Ordo Administrandi* differs in some respects from the Roman Ritual, are we not free nevertheless to follow the latter as instructed by S.R.C. 30 August, 1892, ad. ix? (C.)

REPLY

Canon 30: . . . nisi expressam de iisdem mentionem fecerit, lex non revocat consuetudines centenarias aut immemorabiles, nec lex generalis consuetudines particulares.

S.R.C. 30 August, 1892 ad. ix, n. 3792: Licetne Rituale Romanum ubique

adhiberi et in quibuscunque functionibus, etiamsi proprium Rituale Diocesenum, in nonnullis tantum a Romano discrepans, habeatur? *Affirmative.*

Though the point raised is a small one, an answer involves principles of some interest, namely the application of customary law to liturgical rules, and the right of localities to retain the use of their own ceremonies which are not those of the Roman Ritual.

(i) It is beyond all doubt that the distinctive portions of our marriage rite contained in the *Ordo Administrandi* have been customary in this country, not only for the period of time mentioned in canon 5, but for many centuries previously; they are contained in what is, we believe, the first edition of the book published in 1831; and they are contained therein because the pre-Reformation Sarum form of consent remained in use unchanged: the plighting of troth is identical with that given in the Book of Common Prayer, and in both books the parties are directed to stand.

It has indeed been maintained by some writers that against rubrical laws custom is of no avail. But there are many decisions of the Congregation of Rites which support local customs, and it cannot be denied that, in principle, liturgical law is subject to the canonical rules of canons 25-30. The most that can be said is that it is more difficult to admit custom in liturgical practice than in other matters. Cf. Callewaert, *Liturgicae Institutiones*, I, §139; *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 1929, p. 140.

(ii) The Council of Trent, moreover, at the close of the famous *Tametsi* decree, Sess. xxiv, *de Ref.*, cap. 1, earnestly desired the praiseworthy customs and ceremonies of various provinces to be continued in the celebration of marriage. A reference to the Council used to be contained in the rubric of the Roman Ritual which now reads, n. 6: "Ceterum sicubi aliae laudabiles consuetudines et ceremoniae in celebrando Matrimonii Sacramento adhibentur, eas convenit retineri." S.R.C. 10 June, 1925, in approving the current (1925) typical edition of the Roman Ritual, orders all future editions of the book to be printed in conformity with it; neither this decree, nor any other, prohibits local ritual books, and we find accordingly that the Desclée edition (1935) gives, as an appendix, the English rite with its variations, including the direction about standing, unchanged. If, as seems to us preferable, the obligation of continuing the local use is traced to customary law rather than to any written precept of ecclesiastical authority, no argument of any weight can be drawn from the episcopal approbation of the *Ordo Administrandi*, which reads merely "impense commendamus"; for even the approbation of Pius V which still prefaces the Roman Ritual merely "urges" its adoption—"hortamur", and if we are to hold with Bouix that "hortamur" means "mandamus", there is no reason why the same meaning should not be given to "commendamus".¹

(iii) S.R.C. n. 3792 refers, no doubt, to a local Ritual which, unlike our own, had not the support of custom. It seems to us as certain as anything can well be, in this rather obscure question of customary law, that the clergy assisting at marriages in this country are bound to follow the *Ordo Administrandi*; the acceptance of the ruling in n. 3792 would mean that the English plighting of troth could be omitted, since it is not in the Roman Ritual; but its omission would certainly cause consternation to the faithful who have

¹ Bouix, *De Jure Liturgico*, p. 302. Cf. *Collationes Brugenses*, 1926, p. 414.

been accustomed to it for centuries. They have similarly been accustomed to stand when exchanging their consent, and though the point is, relatively speaking, trivial, the rule should continue until it is changed by authority, as determined by canon 30.

The Holy See frequently directs local customs to conform to the rubrics of the Roman Ritual. But, as regards standing whilst exchanging matrimonial consent, there has appeared no decree reprobating existing customs to the contrary; we have merely the words "ante altare genuflexos" added in the 1925 edition to the introductory rubric, a phrase which neither in its form nor in its context can be considered as abolishing our own custom of standing, which is clearly sanctioned by the rubric in the *Ordo Administrandi*.

CUSTOM AND SUPERIOR'S CONSENT

What is the superior's obligation, in principle, to check customs *contra legem*? It would appear that, if he exercised proper vigilance, no custom would ever reach legal maturity. ("Interested.")

REPLY

Summa Theologica, I-IIae, 97, 3 ad. 3: "... privatae personae legem facere non possunt: sed consuetudo invalescit per actus privatarum personarum; ergo consuetudo non potest obtinere vim legis per quam lex removeatur. *Ad tertium dicendum* . . . si vero multitudo non habeat liberam potestatem condendi sibi legem, vel legem a superiori potestate positam removendi, tamen ipsa consuetudo in tali multitudine praevalens obtinet vim legis, in quantum per eos toleratur, ad quos pertinet multitudini legem imponere: ex hoc enim ipso videtur approbare quod consuetudo introduxit.

Can. 25: Consuetudo in Ecclesia vim legis a consensu Superioris ecclesiastici unice obtinet.

The question is too vast to be answered adequately in the space permitted, but it may be kept within due limits by assuming that the law is one which is in the superior's competence to modify, e.g. a bishop's synodal law which it is becoming customary to disregard. The teaching of St. Thomas, which was of great influence in the development of the law as we have it now in canon 25, establishes that it is the superior's tolerance of the non-observance of a law which gives legal force to a custom *contra legem*, even though it originated with the subject people.

The canon speaks of the superior's "consent", but the Code says nothing about the manner in which this consent is given. The canonists, in addition to express approval, recognize silence as being equivalent, in certain conditions, to consent, on the principle "qui tacet consentire videtur"; but it must be, even so, a real consent, not the kind of silence induced by fear, for example in cases where the civil law is hostile to some point of canon law.

Observing, therefore, that it is becoming customary for his synodal law to be disregarded, the Ordinary may use his right and secure its observance by all lawful means; or he may judge it more prudent to tolerate the custo

That unwritten law,
By which the people keep even kings in awe.

Cf. Commentators on canon 25; *Jus Pontificium*, 1932, XII, p. 18; Guilfoyle, *Custom*, pp. 82-85.

NON-CATHOLIC SEEKING HOLY COMMUNION

A priest distributing Holy Communion observes a youth at the altar rail whom he knows with certainty to be a non-Catholic. What is the correct procedure? (B.)

REPLY

S. Paenit. 10 December, 1860; *Fontes* n. 6426 ad. 21: An possit SS^{ma} Eucharistia notorie censura innodatis ministrari, quin prius fuerint, ut par est, cum Ecclesia reconciliati? *Negative.*

Canon 731, §2: Vetitum est Sacramenta Ecclesiae ministrare haereticis aut schismaticis, etiam bona fide errantibus eaque petentibus, nisi prius, erroribus reiectis, Ecclesiae reconciliati fuerint.

If the non-Catholic status of the youth is known, not only to the priest, but to the rest of the faithful in the church, the priest must obviously refuse him Holy Communion; the circumstances are similar to the case of a public sinner publicly seeking the sacraments. Cf. De Smet, *De Sacramentis*, §161.

The same answer must, in our view, be given, even though it is assumed, firstly, that the youth is in good faith, therefore not a public sinner; secondly, that he has not incurred the censure attached to heresy; thirdly, that his status is unknown to the faithful in the church. The accepted doctrine of all the moralists permits the administration of the sacraments to the unworthy, who are not publicly known to be such, on a principle of natural law requiring a person's good name and reputation to be preserved. But, in these days at least, no ill-repute normally attaches to being publicly regarded as a non-Catholic; nor is the censure usually incurred by such, notwithstanding our practice of ritually absolving from excommunication when receiving them into the Church; cf. *CLERGY REVIEW*, 1933, V, p. 319. Canon 731, §2, it will be observed, is a prohibition quite distinct from that implied in the penalty of canon 2314. As clearly explained in *Periodica*, 1929, XVIII, p. 125, it is not merely an ecclesiastical law, nor is it exclusively based on the necessity of avoiding scandal; it is a divine positive law, an application of the principle that all the sacraments are external signs of the unity of faith existing between all the members of the visible Church, and therefore to be given only to such, even though quite conceivably others might be capable of receiving them validly and fruitfully.

The only exception to this rule of canon 731, §2, apart from the scarcely conceivable case where the priest's knowledge is obtained from the confessional, is the modern teaching, supported by some Roman decisions, which permits *servatis servandis* the administration of Penance and Extreme Unction, but never of the Holy Eucharist, to non-Catholics in danger of death who are destitute of their senses.

The correct procedure in the above case would be for the priest to pass over this youth, and afterwards explain to the congregation, if it is feared that otherwise the youth's reputation may suffer, that he was not a Catholic and had approached the altar rail through a misunderstanding.

ABSOLUTION FORM FOR CHILDREN

Is it lawful, when hearing the confessions of children who have not reached the age of puberty, to omit the words of the form containing absolution from censures? To shorten the form would be convenient occasionally when a large number of children have to be heard in one session. (G. C.)

REPLY

From canon 2230 compared with canon 88, §2, boys up to the age of fourteen completed and girls up to the age of twelve completed are excused from incurring censures, and the words of the form "ab omni vinculo excommunicationis suspensionis et interdicti" are apparently, in their case, useless. There exists no express law that the whole form must nevertheless be said for ritual or ceremonial reasons. Therefore one may omit absolution from censure following the teaching of certain writers, e.g. Cappello, *De Poenitentia*, §80, and Gougnard, *De Poenitentia* (1939), p. 91. None, as far as we can discover, describes how the form should then read, but we are of the opinion, on the principle of canon 88, that the absolution form must be retained exactly as given in the rituals, that the only words which may be omitted are the seven words quoted above.

The common practice of confessors, however, is never to omit anything in the sentence "Dominus noster . . . Spiritus Sancti", except "suspensionis" when the penitent is not a cleric. Without questioning the right of confessors to avail themselves of the opinion given above, our own preference is for the unabbreviated form, as maintained in this REVIEW, 1932, III, p. 506. The words are not utterly senseless, for children may incur censures *ferendae censure* in theory, and, moreover, the phrase "in quantum possum et tu indiges" saves the judgement from being meaningless. As is well known, the words *Misereatur, etc.*, and *Passio Domini, etc.*, may be omitted for appropriate reasons; if, in addition, the phrase *Dominus noster, etc.*, is also reduced, it would mean dismissing penitents in haste with scarcely time for them to make an act of contrition.

ABSOLUTION FROM RESERVED CENSURE

What is the correct procedure in the case of (a) a person absolved under canon 2254 who has failed to have recourse within a month; (b) a person absolved by general absolution during an air raid? It is supposed that both (a) and (b) have mentioned the circumstances and are awaiting the confessor's decision. (N.)

REPLY

(a) The appropriate procedure of canon 2254, §1, may again be used; if the penitent was unaware of the obligation of recourse under pain of incurring the censure, he may either return for absolution to the previous confessor or have recourse once more to the Ordinary. Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1941, XXI, p. 50.

(b) Except the censure in question is either "ab homine" or reserved to the Holy See "specialissimo modo", the reservation has ceased from canon 2252 and no recourse is necessary. Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1941, XXI, p. 50.

E. J. M.

 ROMAN DOCUMENTS

(i) SACRA PAENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA
(OFFICIUM DE INDULGENTIIS)

DECLARATIO CIRCA INDULGENTIAM PLENARIAM CRUCIFIXIS ADNEXAM
SOLUMMODO IN ARTICULO MORTIS LUCRANDAM (A.A.S. xxxiv, 1941,
p. 303).

Aliquo iam tempore, magna cum fidelium admiratione, Crucifixi imagines praebentur, quibus asseveratur Indulgentiam plenariam adnexam esse, ab infirmis lucrandam quotiescumque iidem, corde contrito et amoris dolorisque actum elicientes, unum ex hisce Crucifixis osculaverint; quidam dicunt ab aliquo Praelato, ex peculiari a Summo Pontifice accepta facultate, fuisse benedictos.

Nec desunt qui recens praesertim ad hoc sacrum Tribunal recurrerint ab eodem postulantes utrum haec gratia reapse, ut exponitur, concessa fuerit; itemque significantes rem, utpote omnino extraordinariam, haec mediocrem commovisse admirationem.

Quamobrem hoc sacrum Tribunal—cuius est de Indulgentiarum confessione et usu iudicare—ad falsam praecavendam interpretationem circa S. Matris Ecclesiae hac in causa benignitatem, non modo opportunum, sed necessarium ducit duas illas Declarationes in omnium memoriam revocare hac super re iam editas; illam nempe Supremae S. Congregationis S. Officii d. d. 10 mensis Iunii a. 1914 (*Acta Apost. Sedis*, Vol. VI, pag. 347) et alteram Sacrae huius Paenitentiariae d. d. 23 mensis Iunii a. 1929 (*Acta Apost. Sedis*, Vol. XXI, pag. 510). Atque iterum declarat Crucifixos, qui nostris etiam hisce temporibus eiusmodi gratia ditati distribuuntur, ad normam harum Declarationum benedictos censendos esse; ita ut Indulgentia plenaria solummodo in articulo mortis lucrificari possit, necessariis habitis conditionibus.

Quae omnia, cum Summo Pontifici relata fuerint ab infra scripto Ca-

dinali Paenitentiario Maiore in Audientia diei 4 mensis Iulii vertentis anni, idem Ssmus Dominus declarationem S. Paenitentiariae Apostolicae approbavit, confirmavit et publicandam mandavit.

Datum Romae, e Sacra Paenitentiaria, die 22 Septembris, 1942.

N. Card. CANALI, *Paenitentiarius Maior*.

Happily no change is introduced by this document, which merely confirms the existing law about these crucifixes as explained in this journal, 1940, XVIII, p. 265.

(ii) SACRA CONGREGATIO CONCILII

TERGESTINA DISTRIBUTIONUM (*A.A.S.* xxxiv, 1942, p. 299).

Vi canonis 420, §1, n. 14, Codicis iuris canonici excusantur a choro ut percipiant fructus praebendae ac distributiones quotidianas, inter ceteros, iudices synodales, dum proprio munere funguntur. Iamvero in Capitulo Tergestino dubium ortum est num praescriptum memorati canonis teneat, etiamsi iudex synodalis, non gratuito, sed retributione percepta, ratione huius muneris sibi commissi, absens sit a choro. Et rationem dubitandi idem Capitulum desumit ex comparatione iudicis synodalis cum Vicario Capitulari vel Generali, qui, ad normam canonis 421, §1, n. 3, dum suis muneribus vacant, excusantur quidem a choro ut percipiant praebendae fructus dumtaxat, non autem distributiones quotidianas.

Nam ex praescripto canonis 420 facile argui potest, censet Capitulum, quod Capitulares de quibus in eodem canone est sermo, ideo distributiones quotidianas lucrantur, quia suam operam gratuito impendunt, dum officiis choralibus vacant; quod ceterum congruit praxi Sacrae Congregationis Concilii uti legitur in una *Gerunden*.—*Distributionum choralium* diei 20 Februarii, 1915: "Etenim iuxta canonici iuris sanctionem ac Sacrae Congregationis stylum nullus canonicus a choro absens ratione muneris sibi commissi quotidianas distributiones lucratur, ubi pro dicto munere congruum percipiat stipendium" (*A.A.S.*, Vol. VII, pag. 262 ss.).

ANIMADVERSIONES.—Notandum in primis quod citatus canon 420, §1, n. 14, uti verba sonant, nullam distinctionem admittit, sed regulam claram eamque absolutam statuit, et ubi lex non distinguit, nec nostrum est distinguere.

Praeterea in re de qua agitur per analogiam aptandum est responsum Pontificiae Commissionis ad Codicis I. C. canones authentice interpretandos, die 24 Novembris 1920 datum. Proposito enim dubio: "Utrum in §1 n. 1, canonis 421: *qui de licentia Ordinarii loci publice docent in scholis ab Ecclesia recognitis sacram theologiam aut ius canonicum* etiam comprehendi debeant canonici, qui de Ordinarii licentia docent, retributione peculiari pro lectione percepta; an tantum qui absque tali retributione theologiam vel ius susceperint edocendum", responsum prodiit: "Affirmative ad primam partem, negative ad secundam". Sicut enim distributiones quotidianas lucratur Capitularis qui docet sacram theologiam, etc., retributione percepta, ita a pari de iudice synodali qui ratione huius muneris lucrum facit sentiendum est. Nam ubi eadem est ratio, eadem est iuris dispositio.

Sed ratio iuridica huius rei in hoc praecipue esse videtur, quia persona iuridica Vicarii Capitularis vel Generalis et Officialis alia est a iudice synodali. Officium enim iudicis synodalis non est stabile et firmum, nec hac ratione stabili retributione remuneratum, atque eiusdem retributio in ipsis causis, quae non sunt gratuiti patrocinii, non est certa, sed naturam potius induit oblationis incertae et obventitiae, quod contra evenit de Vicario Generali et Capitulari et de Officiali, quorum munera, cum sint stabilia atque diuturnum et continuum laborem praeseferant, congruum est ut congrua et stabili remuneratione donentur: qua de causa, ad normam canonis 421, §1, n. 3, distributionibus quotidianis iure privantur, cum a choro haec munera obeundi causa abesse cogantur.

RESOLUTIO.—Proposito itaque in Comitiiis Plenariis diei 14 februarii 1942 dubio: *An Capitularis, absens a choro dum munere iudicis synodalis fungitur, lucretu distributiones quotidianas, etiamsi peculiarem retributionem ratione huius muneris percipiat;*

Emi Patres huius Sacrae Congregationis responderunt: *Affirmative.*

Quam resolutionem Ssmus Dominus Noster Pius Pp. XII in Audientia diei 23 Februarii 1942, referente subscripto Secretario, approbare et confirmare dignatus est.

I. BRUNO, *Secretarius.*

Synodal judges in this country function chiefly in matrimonial causes, as explained in art. 13-33 of the Instruction for diocesan tribunals issued by the Congregation of the Sacraments, 15 August, 1936. Cf. canon 1574 and canons 385-388. They must not exceed twelve in number and, once appointed, cannot be removed "nisi ex gravi causa et de consilio Capituli cathedralis".

(iii) SACRA PAENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA

AUGENTUR FACULTATES CIRCA INDULGENTIARUM CONCESSIONEM. (*A.A.S.* xxxiv, 1942, p. 241.)

In fere innumeris observantiae, amoris pietatisque documentis, quibus christifideles quintum ac vicesimum emensum annum, ex quo Augustus Pontifex Pius XII Episcopali dignitate insignitus est, spirituali modo, ex expressa ab eodem Summo Pontifice voluntate, concelebrant, ea peculiari ratione Sanctitati Suae grata obveniunt, quae vel a Purpuratis Patribus vel ab Excellentissimis Episcopis locorumque Ordinariis undique catholici orbis Eidem admoventur; utpote qui communis Patris Pastorisque animo propius adsint, Eiusque gravissimas curas in Ecclesia gubernanda participant.

Quam quidem gratam voluntatem ut Sanctitas Sua testetur, utque paternam sollicitudinem Suam erga universum Sibi creditum gregem ostendat, spirituales Ecclesiae thesaurum latius patere voluit; atque adeo in Audientia, die VIII mensis Iunii infra scripto Cardinali Paenitentiaro Maiori concessa, haec, quae sequuntur, decrevit ac statuit:

I. Facultas impertiendi Benedictionem papalem cum Indulgentia plenaria, de qua in can. 914 Cod. Iur. Can., ita adaugetur, ut Episcopis ter in anno, Abbatibus autem, Praelatis *nullius*, Vicariis ac Praefectis Apostolicis bis in anno eam impertire liceat ad normam eiusdem canonis.

II. Itemque facultas Indulgentias concedendi, Abbatibus ac Praelatis *nullius* per can. 323 data, Vicariis vero ac Praefectis Apostolicis per can. 294, atque Episcopis residentialibus per can. 349 §2 n. 2 impertita, sic augetur, ut iisdem liceat *Indulgentiam centum dierum* concedere. Facultas autem Archiepiscopis per can. 274 n. 2 data, ita pariter adaugetur, ut *ducentorum dierum Indulgentiam* iisdem concedere liceat. Ac postremo, facultas Emis Patribus Cardinalibus per can. 239 §1 n. 24 concessa, ita amplificatur, ut iisdem fas sit *trecentorum dierum Indulgentiam* dilargiri.

Praesenti in perpetuum valituro absque ulla Apostolicarum Litterarum in forma brevi expeditione, et contrariis quibuslibet non obstantibus.

Datum Romae, e Sacra Paenitentiaria, die 20 Iulii 1942.

N. Card. CANALI, *Paenitentiarius Maior*.

(i). Seven different kinds of papal blessing with plenary indulgence were enumerated in this journal, 1940, XIX, p. 367. The present decree, which relates to the blessing delegated to bishops and other prelates from the common law of the Code, increases the number of times it may be given: three times a year instead of twice, in the case of bishops; twice a year instead of once, in the case of other prelates mentioned in canon 914.

(ii). The changes introduced into canons 238, 274, 294, and 323 are likewise very slight, the partial indulgence being increased by periods varying from fifty to a hundred days. The same number of the *Acta* contains another decree of the same date, increasing the partial indulgence obtainable in Rome by the faithful who are touched with their rods by the Major and Minor Penitentiaries of the Roman Basilicas.

(iv) PONTIFICIA COMMISSIO

AD CODICIS CANONES AUTHENTICE INTERPRETANDOS (A.A.S., xxxiv, 1942, p. 241.)

RESPONSA AD PROPOSITA DUBIA

Emi Patres Pontificiae Commissionis ad Codicis canones authentice interpretandos propositis in plenario coetu quae sequuntur dubiis, responderi mandarunt ut infra ad singula:

I—DE DISPENSATIONIBUS MATRIMONIALIBUS

D. An vi canonis 81, conlati cum canone 1045, Ordinarius dispensare valeat ab impedimentis matrimonialibus intra fines eiusdem canonis 81, etsi nondum omnia parata sint ad nuptias.

R. Affirmative.

II—DE INCARDINATIONE RELIGIOSI SAECULARIZATI

D. Utrum verba canonis 641 §2: *Episcopus potest probationis tempus prorogare*, intelligenda sint tantum de prorogatione expressa, an etiam de prorogatione tacita.

R. Negative ad primam partem, affirmative ad secundam.

III—DE IURE ACCUSANDI MATRIMONIUM

D. Utrum, secundum canonem 1971 §1 n. 1 et responsum diei 17 Iulii 1933 ad II, inhabilis ad accusandum matrimonium habendus sit tantum coniux, qui sive impedimenti sive nullitatis matrimonii causa fuit et directa et dolosa, an etiam coniux qui impedimenti vel nullitatis matrimonii causa exstitit vel indirecta vel doli expers.

R. Affirmative ad primam partem, negative ad secundam.

Datum Romae, e Civitate Vaticana, die 27 mensis Iulii, anno 1942.

M. Card. MASSIMI, *Praeses*.

ad. i. Canon 81 states the general principle that Ordinaries may dispense laws which the Holy See is accustomed to dispense, whenever recourse to the Holy See is difficult, and, at the same time, grave harm is feared through delay. Canon 1045, one of the many cited in the footnote to canon 81, is an application of this principle to dispensing marriage impediments, and the grave harm mentioned therein is that which is likely to ensue when everything is ready for the marriage. The meaning of the phrase "omnia sunt parata ad nuptias" is explained in a Rota judgement, 25 May, 1925, discussed in this journal, 1941, XX, p. 78. Canon 81 is wider in its terms than canon 1045, and may be used in dispensing marriage impediments whenever grave harm is feared, even though no arrangements have been made for the marriage. The Ordinary's power arises, firstly, *urgente mortis periculo* from canon 1043; secondly *cum iam omnia sunt parata* from canon 1045; thirdly, *in periculo gravis damni* from canon 81. Some commentators either fail to notice this third category or else require more stringent conditions before permitting the use of canon 81 in dispensing marriage impediments beyond the terms of canon 1045. Cf. Cappello, *De Matrimonio* (1939), §235; Payen, I, §652.

ad. ii. Canon 641, §2, determines that a religious who, though not incardinated in the diocese of a benevolent bishop, has nevertheless been received therein for three years experimentally, becomes *ipso facto* incardinated at the end of a further period of three years, unless he is dismissed before the completion of that period. There is no doubt on the meaning of this law when the bishop expressly extends his reception of the religious for the required period. But even tacit prorogation suffices, as many commentators held, e.g. Goyeneche, *De Religiosis* §100: "Si autem Episcopus primo triennio expleto, nec dimittat nec proroget expresse, prorogatio ad aliud triennium tacite facta putari potest. . . ." Cf. Larraona in *Commentarium pro Religiosis*, 1931, p. 56, for the meaning of *tacit* in this connection.

ad. iii. For the answer dated 17 July, 1933, cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1934, VII, p. 73. A negative reply was given to the question: "An, ad normam

eiusdem canonis 1971, §1.1, habilis sit ad accusandum matrimonium etiam coniux, qui fuerit causa culpabilis sive impedimenti sive nullitatis matrimonii." "Culpable" is now declared to mean "directa et dolosa"; cf. art. 34-42 of the Instruction of the Congregation of the Sacraments, 15 August, 1936, which explains the duties of the Promotor Iustitiae when parties who are legally *inhabiles* bring their cause to him. Such cases are, for the most part, due to immoral conditions and intentions in contracting marriage. A full discussion of this question, and of doubtful cases, may be seen in *Apollinaris*, 1938, xi, p. 201, and 1939, xii, p. 265.

E. J. M.

BOOK REVIEWS

Time and the Timeless. By Rosalind Murray. Pp. 126. (Bles: The Centenary Press. 5s.)

MISS MURRAY'S latest book needs and deserves attentive reading. The chief value of these pages lies in the acute diagnosis which they present of our modern unhappy state: the characteristic mark of the present age being described as its rejection of the non-material and the timeless, and the consequent exclusion of that background against which alone religious belief is possible. We are confronted, as the author neatly expresses it, with "a temporal and material world brought to destruction through excessive concentration on time and matter". Especially penetrating is Miss Murray's analysis of what she calls the Chauvinism of Time and Place: the unformulated conviction that what is believed in our own country and in our own time must inevitably be true, and that what happens here and now is necessarily the best. The latter form of complacency is finding it hard to survive the rude shocks it has sustained during the past few decades; but the persuasion that whatever the latest thinker thinks is rightly thought, though experience has long ago shown it to be unfounded, still sets up an unconscious barrier to any objective consideration of reality. There is also much justice in the author's suggestion that the English mind, subconsciously influenced by the methods of Parliamentary politics, is especially apt to regard as most important that which is acceptable to the greater number. Dr. Hughes, for example, in a book recently reviewed in these pages, lays this down as one of the conditions of propounding a new doctrine: "If the new view," he writes,¹ "is really true and better than the old—and of course this is possible—then it may be stated, providing—and this is the second point to observe—there is a probability of its being accepted."

So much for the diagnosis. Is there any hope of a cure? Miss Murray truly says that "if we are to attract our hearers' interest, we must convince them that we are not the victims of delusion; we must find some common medium of expression, some shared experience, some agreed starting-point". This agreed starting-point Miss Murray finds, chiefly, in the aesthetic sense. In minds whose power to apprehend the spiritual and the timeless has become almost atrophied through disuse, there remains

¹ *Psychology and Religious Truth*, p. 13. See THE CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. XXII, p. 380.

at least "an unconscious aesthetic acceptance and recognition in forms of art of the same quality-of-eternity the existence of which they deny in religion"; here, at least, is an apprehension of the timeless which, though not in itself religious, may yet serve as a ground upon which the religious structure may eventually be erected.

It may be so. But we are inclined to think that the safer and more universally accepted starting-point is not any shared experience, but the power of the human reason which we all have in common, a power which rightly used and aided by God's grace, leads the man of goodwill to the act of faith. Intuitions may, exceptionally and under the divine guidance, play their part in the approach to faith; but unbelievers should hardly be encouraged to count upon them. For the great majority the Christian life is not an "experience" of the spiritual and the supernatural sphere of reality; it is an act of faith constantly renewed, and perhaps only occasionally rewarded in this life with évanescent glimpses of a world unseen. The unbeliever is less likely to be disillusioned with the faith if he is made to understand from the beginning that it is "the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not".

G. D. S.

The Manual of Prayers for Congregational Use. Pulpit edition. Pp. xvi + 279. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. Linen boards 16s. Morocco 30s.)

IT is a favourite pastime of reviewers examining any anthology, whether of verse or prose, to deplore the exclusion of certain pieces and marvel at the inclusion of others. Resisting the temptation as an impertinence, we note that the book, unlike any other collection of vernacular prayers in this country, enjoys the special authorization and approval of the bishops of England and Wales. All printers of devotional books are to follow in the future the standard set therein, and all the clergy are directed to use in their public ministrations the wording chosen. If this injunction is obeyed, a proper measure of uniformity will be secured in public vernacular worship, though it is, perhaps, a sobering reflection to remember that exactly similar directions, prefaced to the original book issued in 1886, have not always been followed.

Amongst the more notable phrases which occur in the commoner prayers are the following: in the *Hail Mary* "among" is the word chosen instead of "amongst"; in the *Divine Praises* "chaste" for "most chaste"; "ever a Virgin" in the *Confiteor* remains as in the previous book, thus rejecting the fairly common "ever Virgin"; in the prayer of the Holy Spirit "relish what is right and just" replaces "be always truly wise"; the night prayer from Compline has "to preserve us in peace, and let thy benediction always rest upon us" instead of "who may keep us in peace, and let Thy blessing be always upon us"; in the prayer for the faithful departed, instead of "by our pious supplications", we have "by loving supplications", a rendering which translates the awkward word "pia" as in the accepted version of the *Salve Regina*; the unhappy juxtaposition of "Sun" and "Son" in the *Litany of the Holy Name* is avoided by the title "Jesus, Child of the Virgin Mary"; throughout the book pronouns referring to the Divine Persons are no longer in capitals.

Many other verbal changes occur which, as the preface indicates, are for

the purpose of avoiding the untidy English and unmanageable prose rhythms caused by a too-literal rendering of the original. With this principle fresh in our minds it is disconcerting to read the first phrase in the book, "We ought to prevent the Sun to bless thee . . .", until we notice that it is the Douay version of Wisdom xvi, 28, which is being quoted. A notable return to an original official phrase is in the *Prayer for England* recited at Benediction. This is now once more "we may be counted worthy", not "we may all deserve" as given in the current "Ritus Servandus". The longer prayers for England used on the second Sunday of the month, composed by Cardinal Wiseman, remain unchanged. On page 266 the direction is that these prayers *may* be said; on page 179 we read that they *should* be. Among the more considerable additions are an alternative short form of morning and night prayer taken from the Ampleforth "Devotions and Prayers", and an alternative set of meditations for the Stations of the Cross. The text of the new *Westminster Hymnal* is used for the translations of liturgical hymns; for example, Mgr. Knox's rendering of *O Salutaris* and *Stabat Mater*.

The prefaces of the bishops and of His Eminence the Cardinal state that a further purpose of this new edition is to bring the details of indulgences up to date with the latest changes. It is the custom of the Sacred Penitentiary to make frequent changes in the grant of indulgences and in the conditions for obtaining them, and no one could reasonably reproach the editors of the Manual for failing to be always up to date. Thus the indulgence attached to the Leonine prayers after Mass is still put as 300 days, whereas actually the grant was increased to ten years in 1934. Some prayers are printed without mentioning the indulgence attached, and there is no uniform practice in citing the date on which the grant was made. The explanation may be that the compilers were directed to use the English "Raccolta", mentioned in the prefaces, which is a translation of the 1929 edition of *Preces et Pia Opera*; the most recent and much fuller edition of this official Vatican text appeared in 1938: it contains (n. 436) the prayer referred to on p. x of the bishops' preface.

Since the book is meant to be, principally and substantially, a collection in the vernacular, one may be thought pedantic in noticing some Latin phrases at the beginning of the Benediction rite, which are a contraction of certain directions given in the "Ritus Servandus". For the convenience of the clergy who may not find it easy to discover the meaning of sentences which are so daringly terse, we reprint them here, adding in brackets the words omitted. "RITUS (SERVANDUS IN SOLEMNI) EXPOSITIONE ET BENEDICTIOE SANCTISSIMI SACRAMENTI. Consuetudo omnino servanda est quae (apud nos invaluit) cantandi hymnum *O Salutaris Hostia* in ipso momento SS. Sacramenti solemniter exponendi. Deinde si addere libuerit preces quaslibet ab episcopo probatas, psalmum, antiphonam, vel litanias adprobatas (hoc loco cantandae vel legendae sunt . . .)."

The book is beautifully printed by the Cambridge University Press on fine paper, sewn on tapes and strongly bound with a French joint, a method widely favoured by the great public libraries which is not only very durable but permits the book to remain open at any place. The clergy will be grateful for this handsome addition to the sacristy library.

E. J. M.

Fundamentals of Peace. By Rev. Edward Quinn. Pp. 69. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 2s. 6d. wrapper, 3s. 6d. cloth.)

THIS examination of the papal peace points, set forth in December 1939, is concerned with the doctrinal background or basis upon which they rest, the last chapter, entitled "Collaboration for Peace", being the outcome of what has preceded. "Collaboration implies a certain unity and is bound to be more effective if all are united in faith; but since these men of good will, seeking for peace, are not in fact united by faith, another basis must be found. This is charity. It is universal love, the love of God first and the love of our neighbour for God's sake." Those of us who are familiar with the papal teaching in recent encyclicals will recall phrases which deny the possibility of people being perfectly united in charity unless their minds agree in faith, the reason being that the primary object of the theological virtue of charity is God himself as faith makes Him known to us. It may be observed that the fifth peace point speaks not of charity, still less of perfect charity, but of that universal love (*amore universale*) which is the compendium and most general expression of the Christian ideal, a choice of words which may be significant.

On the other hand there are phrases, as in *Summi Pontificatus*, which describe "those links which bind them (non-Catholics) to us, our common love of Christ's person, our common belief in God". We have, therefore, it seems, in trying to clarify the basis upon which collaboration between non-Catholics and ourselves is possible, to discover the exact sense in which our faith and theirs, our charity and theirs, is possessed in common. It is beyond dispute that subjectively a non-Catholic may have the supernaturally infused virtues of faith and charity, and may indeed possess them in a greater degree than many Catholics do. Accordingly our efforts are rightly directed towards fostering subjectively these virtues of theirs, and of ours, in order that they may be possessed in the highest possible degree. This is evidently what Fr. Quinn means when he writes: "By whatever diversity of means they attain to it, Catholic and non-Catholic alike must possess that perfect love of God which withholds nothing and which excludes all attachment to creatures, if they are to enter heaven."

But "perfect", without any qualification or distinction, charity cannot be unless the object loved is that which faith proposes for our acceptance. As Leo XIII writes in *Praeclara Gratulationis*, 20 June, 1894: "No doubt we should all be united by the bond of mutual charity. Our Lord Jesus Christ enjoined it most emphatically, and wished that this mutual love for each other should be the mark of His disciples. But how can hearts be united in perfect charity where minds are not joined by faith?"

We are well aware that people at the present time, including many Catholics, are rather averse to discussing these fundamental ideas; there is so much to be done in building up a new social order that they are inclined to be impatient with those who are examining too curiously its basis. It is to the merit of Fr. Quinn's study, well and clearly expressed in simple language, that our attention is directed throughout to the foundations, without which all discussion of the superstructure must be unstable and insecure.

E. J. M.

Our Living Faith. By the Rev. S. M. Shaw. Pp. 152. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 7s. 6d.)

THE duty of the preacher—now, as in the days of St. Paul—is ever the same: to unfold for mankind the doctrine of Christ. That doctrine is unchanged and unchangeable; but although the *materia* of the sermon remains unaltered, the medium varies with the progress of time, and it is the freshness and originality of the *modus praedicandi* which makes a sermon attractive. Obviously Fr. Shaw realizes this. His mode of expression and choice of language give to his work a tone of unexpected brightness. Although he deals with age-old truths, he presents them in a manner acceptable to the modern mind.

"When two persons meet for the first time, they make use of ready-made formulas of conversation. . . . But suppose the two strangers come to know each other better, then what they say when they meet will be of importance to them." Thus does the author begin his explanation of how prayer produces greater holiness, establishing friendship between the soul and God. New turns of thought confront one on every page of this book, making it an easy matter for the reader to maintain his interest, even when the author writes under such familiar titles as Faith, Hope, Charity, Confession and Perseverance. The book is throughout of high merit, but the chapter dealing with the life of Our Blessed Lord makes a vivid and graphic story deserving of particular notice.

There are now few Catholic parishes in this country without their Youth Clubs; and every Youth Club has its library, where there should be at least one copy of *Our Living Faith*. It is exactly the kind of book for young people to study, for it will promote discussion and stimulate enquiry; and one of the most valuable lessons it will leave in the minds of its readers is that our Faith—if it is rightly appreciated—is a living thing, productive of man's highest attainments in the life of the spirit.

L. T. H.

Prayers for Holy Mass for God's Little Sixes and Sevens. Pp. 32. (Turner's, 29 Derby Road, Nottingham. 6d.)

THE Sixes and Sevens have already been provided with a delightful book of prayers for Confession and Holy Communion: and now the Priest who was responsible for that production has followed it with a Mass book on similar lines. This means that the type is large and clear, that the long words are broken up into syllables, and that there are plentiful pictures, pictures drawn with the firm and delicate line which children love. Any child into whose hands this booklet finds its way will at once see the difference between the prayer book formerly lent to him in church to keep him quiet, and *this* book which has obviously been prepared for him to use by himself.

For every important part of the Mass—from the Confiteor to the Last Gospel—there is a page-title in beautiful bright red, with an illustration enabling the child to identify each part by comparing the picture with the present action of the priest; and every picture has its appropriate set of prayers. To turn a page is to take a new step in the progress of the Mass, a measured step, side by side with the priest. Having this most admirable

guide to help them, the Sixes and Sevens can now take their place in church for the Holy Sacrifice, left alone by their elders to a most attractive and instructive independence.

L. T. H.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE ENDS OF MARRIAGE

(CLERGY REVIEW, 1942, XXII, pp. 566-569)

Fr. X writes:

Canon Mahoney has met my objection fully and fairly, as I expected that he would. His distinction between tradition "in the strict dogmatic sense" and tradition "in the sense of what is customary, established, or ancient", is entirely satisfying, and nothing could be fairer than the way he makes a present of the qualification "traditional", in this second sense, to a theological view opposed to his own.

One of the more creditable reasons for anonymity is that it makes the admission of one's mistakes easier, so I have no difficulty in admitting that possibly I was a bit hasty in raising the alarm, as Canon Mahoney seems to think. My excuse must be that we, the "G.P.s" of theology, the "lower deck" of the theological ship, are easily frightened by the word "tradition". So when we met it accompanied by a reference to Canon Law and to a Papal Encyclical, some of us, who are interested in Dr. Doms's theory of marriage because of its utility in pastoral practice, began to fear for its safety as a probable opinion. We are relieved to hear that it has nothing to fear from anything that Canon Mahoney has said.

Perhaps it would save trouble if the word "classical" were substituted for "traditional" in all such cases as this, where it is important to exclude the strict dogmatic sense of the word "traditional". The *Osservatore Romano* set the example in its review of Dr. Doms's book, where it calls the view opposed to Dr. Doms "the classical doctrine", not the traditional doctrine. Others have followed this example, and its general use ought to make for that peace of mind which comes of saying in such weighty matters unmissably what one means, and of hearing it from one's neighbour in like manner.

I thank both the Editor and Canon Mahoney for their courtesy.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

urch
and

H.

T

roc

—7

I ex-
stric
estab-
than
econd

son

es the
g than
ms to

bla

lower
tion".
to a
ory of
or its
ing to

reg

cry

ituted

clude

omaw

view

ctrine

ke for

anmis

n like

sta

sic

thy

qu

ha

—

7

tha

roc